

THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

BY

E. S. P. HAYNES

AUTHOR OF "THE DECLINE OF LIBERTY IN ENGLAND"



LONDON
CRANT RICHARDS LTD.
ST MARTIN'S STREET
MDCCCXXIII

Printed in Great Britain
by The Riverside Press Limited
Edinburgh

TO
WILLIAM CLARKE HALL

(49668)

“ 'Tis liberty alone that gives the flower
Of fleeting life its lustre and perfume ;
And we are weeds without it. All constraint,
Except what wisdom lays on evil men,
Is evil, hurts the faculties, impedes
Their progress in the road of science, blinds
The eyesight of discovery and begets
In those that suffer it, a sordid mind,
Bestial, a meagre intellect, unfit
To be the tenant of man's noble form.”

Cowper.

“He (Mr Justice Avory) only wished to add that he could not concur in the reason given by the magistrate when he said that there was strong public feeling that these regulations should not be unduly maintained and enforced. In his (Mr Justice Avory's) view this sort of legislation, which was intended to restrain the vicious propensities of those who indulged in the eating of sweetmeats up to bedtime, must be maintained and enforced to keep such vicious propensities in check.”—MR JUSTICE AVORY, as reported in *The Times* of 14th April 1923.

PREFACE

“MANKIND is tired of liberty. . . . Let it be known once and for all that Fascismo has already passed—and if it be necessary will tranquilly turn to pass again—over the more or less putrescent corpse of the Goddess of Liberty.”¹ Thus writes Signor Mussolini in the April issue of the *Gerarchia*, and his words are worth quoting if only to remind us that the Latin associations of the word liberty connote riots and red caps, whereas for the Briton the word suggests law and order. For us the loss of liberty is only justified by the necessity of coping with war or sedition ; law and order are the natural companions of liberty. In Great Britain we are at the moment as tired of dictators as Mussolini is of liberty.

In these circumstances it may seem unnecessary for me or anyone else to deal further with the subject ; but there are cogent reasons for not letting it drop. The first reason is

¹ Translation quoted from *Times* of 2nd April 1923.

that the franchise has been immensely enlarged and that the new voters need to have every issue of political discussion before them. The practical working of a democratic franchise in the United States can scarcely encourage any lover of liberty. The second is that certain fallacies of Collectivism appear to enjoy by virtue of frequent iteration the sanctity of the decalogue for many of the present generation. The third is that Collectivism like other established creeds has created a priesthood and other vested interests which proliferate more and more at the expense of the community at large.

The general result is that democracy is more and more exploited by small groups of fanatical faddists and of unscrupulous adventurers and these groups combine to cajole unsuspecting majorities who (to adapt the old phrase) vote but do not govern. No doubt we have all heard this before. Most of us have read John Stuart Mill's *Essay on Liberty*, and many of us have read Sir Henry Maine's *Popular Government*. We are all of us only too familiar with newspaper rhetoric about liberty in time of war. But how many of us realise to-day that

liberty is a live issue in everyday life and politics and that indifference to that issue may lead us into disasters quite as overwhelming as those which have destroyed every Empire but the British Empire ?¹

Our world of to-day is busy in the task of levelling everybody down to the same standard of servitude. Measures to abolish the amenities of aristocracy, to impoverish the well-to-do, and to harass the poor by diminishing the small amount of liberty they still enjoy seem to inspire the only relics of political enthusiasm left to an otherwise disillusioned generation. When one remembers the ideals of those who died in the War to defend them one cannot but mourn that death has removed a multitude of young men who, if now alive, would have been the first to protest against the modern developments of the Servile State. The resources of our civilisation give immense power to any Government and the individual counts for nothing. It may be that all protest is futile ; but it is difficult to avoid protesting.

My thanks are due to Mr Ashton-Gwatkin,

¹ The recent death of Mr W. H. Mallock is a fresh blow to the cause of clear thinking and public enlightenment.

Mr Ives, and Miss Stella Browne for useful suggestions and information and to Mr A. P. Herbert and Mr Arnold Lupton for permission to print their remarks on Prohibition and Socialism. Some of my chapters have already appeared in *The Saturday Review*, *The Hibbert Journal*, *The Literary Guide*, and *The New Witness*.

April 1923.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	13
CHAPTER	
I. CONTEMPORARY HISTORY	27
II. CHURCH AND CHAPEL	39
III. THE MODERN PURITAN	53
IV. THE COLLECTIVIST	62
V. THE COMMUNIST	75
VI. THE PROHIBITIONIST	93
VII. THE PRUDE	102
VIII. THE WAR-LORD	114
IX. THE SUPER-CAPITALIST	127
X. THE POLITICIAN	139
XI. TO THE FRIENDS OF LIBERTY	148
APPENDICES	159
INDEX	180

INTRODUCTION ·

WE do not always realise that the idea of individual liberty as a right was unknown to the ancient world and is still unknown either in the Near East or the Far East. In China the individual is insignificant except as the member of a family or of a village community. Japan, so far as this idea is modified, has merely imported German ideas. In Turkey the idea is rudimentary; and in Russia we have seen a whole nation assimilating Bolshevism. Individual liberty may have existed in fact; but it was not recognised as a right. I have pointed out elsewhere that in the ancient world there was practically no such idea as individual liberty, for liberty can only repose on some sort of individualism. In the decline of the ancient world we see an approach to individualism in the shape of the Stoic philosophy, and this is the soil from which springs the individualism of Christianity. When Jesus Christ said that a man must leave his father and his mother in order to follow Him this idea was far more revolutionary than it may appear to a modern

European, for it represented a revolt against the unit of the family, and this revolt spreads farther when we find the Christian refusing to worship the gods of his country or to serve in the army.

Individualism is further developed under the feudal system, which is a compromise between purely patriarchal and purely political society. The feudal tie of allegiance at least recognised the rights of the small property owner and the voluntary character of his service. Feudalism implied and preserved the association of property owners whether the property was great or small. Moreover, the feudal system as developed in England favoured individualism more than on the Continent, for the more efficient centralisation of government in England severely controlled private war, and in this way developed the proprietary instinct in an atmosphere of peace. Thus England became the home of small owners, and, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of yeomen farmers, who, like the peasant proprietors of France in the nineteenth century, after the Revolution, became the bulwark of liberty. For liberty is essentially bound up with property.

The love of liberty in England was no doubt seriously weakened by the industrial revolution

which, after one hundred years, went far to destroy the prosperity of small farmers and land-owners, and also created a vast proletariat without any property at all. The need for reconciling the prosperity of the super-capitalist with the necessities of common humanity produced towards the end of the nineteenth century the tendencies which Mr Belloc has crystallised in his book entitled *The Servile State*. If indeed the modern civilised country is to escape the fate of becoming a crowd of propertyless persons dragooned by the masters of industry, it can only encourage the peasant proprietor and the small investor, who in their turn will probably practise some sort of birth control on the French model; and to those who consistently advocate the provision of cannon-fodder on a large scale I can only retort that a nation like France is far more stable and has better roots than a nation of hordes which can only be dragooned by military or some other form of coercion. The existence of an individual liberty which implies the prosperity of small ownership and a large sense of individual responsibility, secures to a nation a certain vitality which cannot otherwise be obtained, and the absence of liberty and all that it connotes exposes the State to a process of what by analogy may be called cancerous proliferation.

Lord Bryce¹ classifies liberty under four heads, namely, (1) civil liberty, as meaning exemption from control of the citizen in respect of his person and property; (2) religious liberty, as meaning exemption from control of the citizen in the expression and practice of his religious opinions and his worship; (3) political liberty, as meaning the participation of the citizen in the government of the country in which he lives; and (4) individual liberty, as meaning exemption of the citizen from control in matters which do not so plainly affect the welfare of the whole community as to render control necessary.

I should perhaps mention that in this essay I do not propose to deal with the question of liberty except where the State is directly or indirectly concerned, and it must not be forgotten that the best type of government defends liberty by keeping in check the tyranny of factions, groups, corporations, secret societies or powerful individuals. Bearing this in mind, let us see what the above definitions of liberty really mean. Personally, I do not see any substantial distinction between the first, second, and fourth definitions. If the State feels justified in controlling the person and property of the citizen it certainly will not refrain from also

¹ *Modern Democracies*, vol. i., p. 60. London, 1921.

interfering with his religion and his personal habits ; and during the Great War even the Government of Great Britain interfered with the citizen in all these respects. Conscription implied interference with Quaker meetings and with facilities for obtaining fermented liquors.

The participation of the citizen in government is, as Lord Bryce himself admits, impracticable in large communities ; for in large communities the citizen at an election usually gets nothing but the choice of equally uncongenial men and measures except on very broad issues such as the issues of war and peace.

Nevertheless, the above classification can perhaps be used for a comprehensive definition of liberty as the freedom of the citizen in respect of his person, his property, religion, conduct, and expression of opinions except where this freedom is limited by considerations of public safety. I invite special attention to the last two words, because I think that the most common infringement of liberty in our day is that of the person who wishes to impose social experiments on society by force and coercion instead of by persuasion.

Having thus defined liberty, I now come to the subject of this essay, which is the classification of those who oppose liberty for one reason or another. The enemy of liberty is

the man who seeks to coerce and subordinate other citizens either for (1) his own benefit, such as a Bolshevik or a certain type of plutocrat; or (2) to promote some notion of what may be loosely described as a notion of social welfare. In either case he may use persuasion and propaganda up to a certain point; but he will not scruple to use force or coercion in the end. The first type of man is obviously an enemy of society if his motives are detected. The second type of man is not an obvious enemy of society and is often credited with excellent intentions, though just as often the man who seeks to subordinate others for his own benefit professes the utmost philanthropy. The defender of liberty is, however, not primarily concerned with the motives of the enemy. He is ready to concede either to private enterprise or to social experiment a fair field and no favour; but he will not agree to society being exploited either by the Bolshevik or by a well-meaning Collectivist.

It may be instructive at this point to speculate on what forms of coercion are most ready to hand for those who wish to destroy liberty. In past ages both custom and religion have usually been the most potent weapons of coercion, and the State has supported the use of these weapons in so far as it has sanctioned

the establishment of an Inquisition, as in mediæval Europe, or the dominion of mob law, as in the case of lynching in the United States of America. In our own day we have seen both the moral influence and the legal support of religion and custom considerably weakened. Force and coercion have been in recent years more commonly exercised, either directly by the State, or indirectly through the State by corporations or by secret societies or by privileged plutocrats who have been able to buy secret influence in the choice of government measures. For example, great power has been exercised by Trusts, both here and across the Atlantic; and we are now threatened by the advent of the Ku-Klux-Klan. The sale of honours has at last been condemned by the British Government in a way which does not prevent rich men obtaining more than a proper share in the government of the country. No one but a snob much cares whether honours are bought or sold; but it is essential that policies should not be bought or sold, and there can be no security on this head unless and until the Party Funds are publicly audited.

The principal test, however, of what constitutes hatred of liberty is the limit of what is deemed necessary before force and coercion are invoked. It is of course clear that force

and coercion are necessary for the protection of public safety, as for instance, in the preservation of public order and public health, and in all questions of national defence. It is obvious that individual liberty can only exist under the protection of a strong government which suppresses not only crime but also the tyranny of the individual and the group. The question of liberty only becomes difficult in cases where there is any doubt as to the necessity for coercion. But modern democracy always seems to be enlarging the necessities of public safety into the necessities of social welfare.

I may perhaps take as examples two typical cases which appear to be on the border-line. The first is that of compulsory education. There are probably many persons to-day who do not see why education should be compulsory, and certainly the ideal plan would be for every parent who sends his child to a State school to make some small contribution to the expense of his child's education, and also to have some right of criticising the methods and subject-matter of that education. It is unfortunate that the ordinary artisan should in any way be induced to regard the educational authority as nothing better than a kind of policeman who can fine him for not

sending the child to school. On the other hand, I think that on reflection most of us will admit that in a modern industrial community universal education is an absolute necessity and that compulsion is therefore justified. Life for a skilled or even an unskilled artisan in a big city becomes impossibly complicated without some knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and an educated population is essential for success in commercial competition with other nations.

The second border-line case is that of vaccination. Here again the ideal plan is perhaps to pursue the present system of not making vaccination compulsory. For the citizen may plausibly claim the right to run the risk of infection if he regards vaccination as useless or as a remedy worse than the disease. On the other hand, it must be admitted that a modern ministry might find itself severely censured if this system ever led to the spread of smallpox on so large a scale that it passed beyond medical control.

I mention these two cases because the fact that many people do not regard either education or vaccination as really necessary but do not object to their being made compulsory has probably produced a certain mental confusion, on the strength of which it is sometimes

presumed that the State has a right to make any measure compulsory which may be presumed to promise good results in the region of either health or morals.

In analysing the motives of those who wish to make social welfare compulsory one finds three fairly distinct types, namely, (1) the fanatic; (2) the bully; and (3) the megalomaniac. The fanatic is on moral grounds entitled to some respect. This type of person was in bygone ages inclined to think that God would punish blasphemy in a community by destroying the State, or heresy in an individual by eternal fire. In the twentieth century it is easy to counter the religious fanatic by the test of verification, such as the late Mr Bradlaugh employed when, according to the common story, he took out his watch and suggested that God could demonstrate his existence by annihilating him (Mr Bradlaugh) before he counted thirty seconds by his watch. In these days, however, it is not so easy to expose the fallacies of the fanatic. It was, for instance, not too easy to prove on a platform that all crime was not directly or indirectly due to drink before Prohibition had been adopted in the United States of America. And a fanatic is always formidable in proportion to the strength of his conviction. He is sometimes the victim of

fear or panic, and sometimes a monster of intellectual self-complacency; but he can at least be reasoned with in so far as he is sincere.

The bully is perhaps a more formidable enemy, because he finds support both from those like himself and also from a certain number of other persons who enjoy the process of being bullied and dragooned if this relieves them from responsibility. As the War demonstrated, there is a certain type of man who thoroughly enjoys a military or communal life and cannot understand the individualist revolt against restraint of this kind. The bully is sometimes hypocritical, in the sense that he pretends to be concerned with the question of public safety; but he often quite frankly avows that the citizen should exist for the State and not the State for the citizen. He is not very formidable when he is no more than a vain busybody; but he is more dangerous when he represents the type of philanthropist who is always expecting too much from his fellow-creatures and insists on cutting their heads off if they do not live up to his standard of righteousness.

The type varies in different countries. In England there has always been a certain amount of aristocratic bullying by the squire or parson; but to-day this is insignificant as

compared with the crude puritanism of many Labour members and the incessant interference of pious persons with the private affairs of the individual.

Then again, the prosperity of the first decade of the twentieth century, coupled with the sterility of the modern woman, let loose a number of men, and even more women, who either through vanity or indolence found it convenient to neglect private obligations, and especially family obligations, in order to undertake what they were pleased to call "public work" which involved the indulgence of their curiosity and desire to interfere with the lives of the poor. As Mr G. K. Chesterton has pointed out, public life is much easier to carry on without disaster than the rearing of a family or the successful conduct of a business concern. The hostility to liberty of these men and women is oddly illustrated by their tendency to join in any form of philanthropy which interferes with freedom, whether in connection with the consumption of fermented liquors, petty gambling in the street, or courtship in public spaces. To interfere with those who were too poor to enjoy any privacy not only indulged the men's desire to domineer over others and the women's unsatisfied maternal instincts but also ministered to their vanity,

because these activities obtained a vaguely honorific flavour of what is called social reform. No doubt, also, the general decline of religion has led to a considerable amount of moral persecution under police supervision. Fortunately for the poor, these social reformers began to obtain control of public money, and squandered it in so blatant a manner that it looks as if their wings might sooner or later be clipped. I have, however, had it forced on my notice that persons of this type will never support any kind of society which is out to promote any kind of liberty or which cannot be linked up with some kind of unctuous catchword.

• The megalomaniac is a type of person who is possessed not so much by an instinct of domination as by a blind belief in organisation. He is out to reduce the sphere of what Lord Moulton called "the unenforceable region of conduct"; that is to say, he is always anxious to enlarge the sphere of legal compulsion and to diminish the sphere of moral obligation. He wishes the State to monopolise all means of production, and he wants municipal trading and transport. The State is to own all hospitals, and individual activity is everywhere to be superseded by collective activity. This kind of megalomania seems bound up with the modern belief in mass production, super-joint-stock companies,

commercial trusts, and in making everything rather too big for its boots. This kind of person rarely sees the difficulty of production on a large scale, and his experiments are apt to end in the same sort of disaster as occurred in the building of the ill-fated liner, the *Great Eastern*, which was so unwieldy that she had to be beached and left to rot almost as soon as she was made.

It is, of course, clear that some modern enterprises must be run on a scale in proportion to the increasing complexity of the world. This consideration necessarily affects all activities or enterprises connected with war or the international prevention of war or the defence of the individual against monopoly. But in these days we are all far too ready to forget that the lack of individual responsibility must necessarily produce collective weakness, and that the encouragement to co-operation must never be postponed to mere grandiosity of State management. It may reasonably be urged that if the State is to step in on one side more than another it should protect the interests of the small land-owner and investor against the ever encroaching powers of plutocrats and bureaucrats.

CHAPTER I

CONTEMPORARY HISTORY

IN this chapter I shall try to recapitulate some contemporary history in so far as it affects the question of individual liberty. The principal danger to liberty as well as to all other good things in life is that the ordinary individual can only give to public affairs the very small surplus of energy that remains to him after his daily work and play. The great mass of men are comparatively shrewd in all matters except those which pertain to art, letters, and politics. The world is extraordinarily tolerant of the information that is supplied to it in magazines and newspapers, and especially in the region of education. In the sphere of art, education, and politics there is a far less exacting standard than in the sphere of professional or commercial life, and the desire for individual liberty has often been suppressed by politicians and political philosophers assuring the general public that it is impracticable. The principal bulwark of liberty in this country has been the prejudices

28 . THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

of a highly cultivated aristocracy, deriving particularly from the eighteenth century, though the roots of those prejudices go right back to the foundation of the English aristocracy in the twelfth century.

The reader will perhaps excuse my recapitulating to some extent what I wrote in my first book on the subject of liberty.¹ When the book appeared it was very hotly abused in nearly every section of the Press; but to-day, after seven years, a great deal of it has been accepted and many of the suggestions in it have been adopted, especially in regard to women. A number of other books on the subject have since been written by authors like Mr Bertrand Russell, who explored the subject from a very different point of view.

I think that the main tendency to-day has been to destroy the bureaucratic contempt of liberty which was set up by Mr Lloyd George. This is principally due to the intervention of big newspaper magnates who did not so much object to bureaucracy in itself as to the heavy expense entailed by it. Mr Lloyd George as Prime Minister not only imposed a vast burden of expense and bureaucratic tyranny all over the country but also set up in his own person

¹ *The Decline of Liberty in England*, pp. 210-220. London, 1916.

a kind of American Presidency which resulted in every Government Department becoming responsible to himself or to his private secretaries. This system was also bolstered up by a Government press agency, which was naturally at pains to suppress any unfavourable comment on the Lloyd Georgian scheme of government.

Perhaps I may briefly summarise what happened by reminding my readers of certain recent changes. Land Taxes in the People's Budget have by now been abolished after producing the most disastrous results. These results included not only the bankruptcy of many builders and other small men but also the terrible housing famine, which will produce hardship to the poor for perhaps twenty years more. On the other hand, the temporary encouragement of agriculture in 1918 did much to encourage the farmer and peasant, and would have led to thoroughly wholesome conditions in agricultural life if Mr Lloyd George had not gone back on all his promises and abandoned the farmer just when he was beginning to obtain some permanent security. The present ministry may come to the rescue; but in modern politics it is always difficult to protect the interest of any honest worker against the machinations of the middleman, and undoubtedly

30 . THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

the farmer gets far less return for his work than the big Trusts which spring up to beat him down for his milk and to squeeze the highest price they can out of the equally helpless consumer.

On the question of fermented liquors some progress has been made; but the existing restrictions on the hours of selling drink will remain so long as they suit the financial convenience of the brewers. Fortunately for the Conservatives the Labour Party is still led by a number of narrow Puritans who have not the slightest idea of constructing a political programme. They alienate sensible men by vaporous schemes of taxing land values and of local option. On the former item in their programme they were singularly reticent at the time of the last election, and most candidates confessed themselves unable to explain what scheme was intended, though at least one candidate admitted that he had always heartily disapproved of the Land Taxes of 1910.- On the question of local option they seem equally vague; but if once this scheme is set on foot it will have the effect of concentrating all drunkards into narrower areas and in this way strengthening the hand of the teetotaler.

The power of the police remains very much what it was seven years ago, though the arrest

of Sir Almeric FitzRoy has had a most salutary effect both on the superfluous activities of the Police Force and the astounding credulity of police magistrates. Nevertheless, the policeman still continues in his mysterious way his blunders to perform, and although the metropolitan police are comparatively sane in their attitude towards blasphemy and Malthusian doctrines, it was quite surprising to read in the newspapers not long ago that the vendors of a most harmless work by Mrs Sanger had been arrested, although the British Government, unlike the federal government of the United States, have taken no notice of Mrs Stopes's writings.

In some other respects there is little progress. The whole machinery of the Servile State continues, and the scope of the futile Insurance Act has been extended to unemployment. Any wise legislation for supporting the institution of the family appears to be quite out of the question. The family are not protected as they are in Scotland against the caprice of a father who excludes his wife and children from any benefit under his will, and all legislation for legitimization by subsequent marriage has so far been defeated. The only bills at present on foot have no retrospective effect, and in this way the parents of an illegitimate child who

have since married are denied all opportunity of doing justice to that child, so that the only persons who can benefit by the bill are those who have illegitimate children after the passing of the bill.¹ Some time ago the Archbishop of Canterbury declared that he was incapable of grasping the legal difficulties involved by legislation on the subject; but these difficulties are by no means insurmountable, and are certainly far easier to adjust than many others with which the legislator has to deal every day.

The divorce question remains very much where it was seven years ago, except that, after an incredible amount of agitation, local divorce in a very restricted number of assize courts is allowed for poor cases and undefended cases. This is the first step in a movement which will probably end in the extension of divorce jurisdiction to the county courts; but it is a far from satisfactory solution of the whole question. The public discussion of the problem in the form of newspaper correspondence studiously ignores the findings of the Royal Commission, and the same idiotic excursions into irrelevant theology by ignorant persons continue indefinitely. Most newspaper editors seem to prefer filling their columns with this kind of stuff to evolving any coherent

¹ I trust that this will be put right in the end.

programme of reform. Meanwhile they are careful to suppress any letter which refers to the fact that rich people habitually obtain divorce by mutual consent or that the sworn instructions of a poor person to his solicitor are always at the disposal of the King's Proctor.

All this would not be so intolerable if it did not occasionally result in cases of preposterous injustice, such as the case of Mr Charman, who came back from the War in 1915 to find that his wife was permanently alienated from him and refused to live with him. Incessantly pursued by her in the police court, he was on more than one occasion sentenced to imprisonment for arrears of maintenance. Finally she told him that she would send him to prison again if he did not give her evidence of adultery. He went to an hotel with a respectable young woman and allowed such evidence to be presumed against him. Just before her petition was heard he discovered that she had had a child by another man and filed a cross-petition against her. When the two petitions were heard he produced evidence of the young woman's virginity, and was then prosecuted for conspiring to deceive the court. Why he and not his wife should be prosecuted remains a mystery; but in spite of the fact that Colonel Wedgwood, M.P., had announced some

34 . THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

years before that he had deceived the court in precisely the same manner, this poor man was imprisoned for four months because he had presumed to ape the privileges of the rich.

In regard to the citizenship of women considerable progress has been made, inasmuch as a woman is now entitled to sit in the House of Commons and on a jury, and to be a solicitor, barrister, or Justice of the Peace. Much as some women object to discharging public functions, I think that the work they have done so far is most encouraging on the side of public economy and, to that extent, of liberty. Their right to sit on a jury prevents them being told that they have no business to understand certain mysteries of crime in connection with sex; and although I have heard complaints of their wishing to inflict heavier sentences than the male magistrate, I am inclined to think that this is entirely due to a woman having a stricter sense of duty and being less sentimental in certain cases. Women, however, still suffer a certain amount of injustice, though in many respects they are unfairly privileged. The principal injustice which they suffer to-day is the difficulty of obtaining maintenance from a deserting husband, and the deprivation even of access to their children in the case of divorce.

Social freedom, by which I mean freedom from the tyrannical interference of the community with the affairs of the individual, is on the whole more developed than it was seven years ago. Priests, ministers, and even moralists have to tread a little more delicately than they were accustomed to do before the atmosphere of war blew away so many of the taboos which brooded over the daily life of Great Britain in the nineteenth century. In the recent discussion which arose out of the murder of Mr Thompson by Mr Bywaters it was curious to observe the direction that public censure took. The relations between Mrs Thompson and Mr Bywaters did not appear to shock the public mind ; but everyone asked why Mrs Thompson could not have left her husband without causing him to be murdered. This at any rate shows a saner phase of public morality.

In short, there is to-day plenty of lip service to liberty ; but nobody can deny that “ eternal vigilance ” is even more required than in normal times. The strength of the herd instinct grows with the spread of the newspaper habit, and the enemies of liberty are constantly shrieking about dangers which necessitate prying interference with the individual. One of the most eminent thinkers of to-day once told me that

36 · THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

modern society might properly be compared to a crowd of people on a huge raft, and that in default of drastic measures one side of the raft might be at any moment submerged. It is perhaps not surprising that he should have subsequently defended the Bolshevist régime ; but there are other ways of ensuring the stability of the raft besides executing most of the people on it. I cannot help feeling that statesmen had better address themselves to the problem of evolving a State which can command the allegiance of its citizens without spiritual or other coercion, however necessary coercion may be in the case of men or women who are incapable of any sort of allegiance.

Perhaps the two most important factors in an industrial civilisation are the masters of industry and the leaders of the Labour Party. Neither the super-capitalist nor the Labour leader appears to have much regard for liberty. The master of industry finds it convenient to expand the machinery of the Servile State, and the Labour leader does not seem to realise the importance of individual responsibility as opposed to the collective discipline of the trade unions. Both sets of men appear to think along the same grooves, and it looks as if the friends of liberty would not succeed in doing much more than get this country back to the

conditions of 1914. But this standard is after all too low, for in 1914 Mr Lloyd George had already introduced much of his favourite legislation from Berlin. The Insurance Act and the whole system of doles and subsidies linked up with it deserve repeal quite as much as the Land Taxes. Their benefits are illusory, and therefore positively mischievous because they encourage the poor to expect more from the State than the State can do; which on the one hand destroys the poor man's sense of independence, and on the other exasperates him when he finds that instead of getting ninepence for fourpence he is simply throwing fourpence into the gutter.

The most important question of all, perhaps, is the prestige of Parliament. In 1910 it was the House of Lords which stood in the dock because it was supposed to be nothing but a machine for passing Tory legislation and blocking all other legislation. To-day, however, the House of Lords enjoys the respect of the people, and it is the House of Commons which is not trusted after its discreditable history under the Lloyd George régime. So long as this distrust continues there will be a great deal of noisy talk about direct action, and direct action involves direct revolt. Even before the existence of the last two Coalitions the House of

Commons got into the habit of passing the most poisonous measures, which were usually called non-controversial; and owing to the absence of discussion many of them were quite unknown to the public until a poor person was sent to prison for committing a crime of which no one had heard. It is to be hoped that a more healthy atmosphere will prevail in the present House of Commons, where collusion between the Front Benches is perhaps less likely to occur than it did between the Front Benches of the old parties.

CHAPTER II

CHURCH AND CHAPEL

DURING the last fifty years Church and Chapel have had their claws considerably cut in regard to personal interference with the individual, at any rate in the British Empire ; yet the process of emancipation has been comparatively recent if we remember that it was not until 1640 that the Church ceased to exercise the functions of the police magistrate, and until 1857 that the institution of marriage ceased to be under ecclesiastical control. It may be instructive to remember that nine years afterwards, namely, in 1866, a man was prosecuted for not going to church. So far as the Church of England was concerned the weapon of excommunication vanished in the early part of the nineteenth century, and this form of social discipline had no name until Captain Boycott unwillingly bestowed his name upon a form of excommunication which did not have to be enforced by the Church.

The influence of Church and Chapel had at least one merit, namely, that it set up a moral

standard independent of the State, and made it easier for the ordinary citizen to grasp the essential difference between what is legal and what is moral. That distinction is to-day getting a little blurred. By 1900 the State was beginning to construct a morality of its own which to some extent displaced the doctrines of the Church. As from that time it became possible for any citizen to grow up from childhood and to pass into a State school or possibly a reformatory, and by conforming to the legal requirements of the State to hold an unblemished moral record even if he had never been inside any sacred edifice. Few people in these days are ever asked whether they go to church or chapel or whether they belong to any religious denomination. I can even remember a time when as a Balliol undergraduate I believed that the State could take over the whole department of morality from the Church and make a better job of it. We have all by now been taught to realise the utter inadequacy of modern State morality either to prevent war or to preserve the vestiges of any human feeling during war.¹

By a curious irony Church and Chapel have concentrated on morality as their principal

¹ Great Britain certainly has a higher standard in this respect than any other country.

department of public activity. They seem to have an uneasy feeling that a joint manifesto on any important question of religious belief would neither interest nor edify the general public. But whenever there is any question of interfering with street betting, beer drinking, birth control, or movies, persons like the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Chief Rabbi, and a miscellaneous collection of Nonconformist ministers which does not as yet include any exponent of Christian Science, all sign a manifesto declaring their unanimous opinion that this or that form of repression or interference commands their approval. It is possible that if all these reverend gentlemen were asked to sign a manifesto about major or minor miracles, or about the doctrine of the Trinity, they would enter upon really serious disputation. On the other hand, these joint manifestoes conceal a certain amount of diversity even on points of morals. An observant scout at Oxford is said to have remarked that Low Church people ate and High Church people drank; and the Confessional would also be a serious stumbling-block to harmony if it were ever discussed by the signatories to moral manifestoes. Yet the manifestoes continue, and it would appear that all these dignitaries

42 . THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

are anxious to be advertised as the champions of what they consider to be sound morality. They have lost all their old powers of ecclesiastical coercion in regard to personal conduct, and the policeman has stepped into their shoes ; but nevertheless they wish us all to know that they have not lost interest in the subject and that the policeman has their heartfelt support.

The principal interference of Church and Chapel is connected with the subjects of (1) marriage (including divorce and birth control) ; (2) property ; (3) intoxicating liquors ; and (4) Sunday games. Directly we analyse the attitude of Church and Chapel on these points the variations become apparent. On the question of property the Cardinal is usually sound, for the Catholic Church has always had the sense to support the principle of private property logically and thoroughly. Anglicans wobble on this question as on most others. Some of them go in for a vague Socialism, and when the Licensing Bill was introduced in 1908 some of the most pious clergy, including the Bishop of London, distinguished themselves by denouncing the most fundamental principles of private property, and thereby forfeited most of the sympathy that they might otherwise have gained in opposing the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church.

Nonconformist ministers joined their Anglican brethren in this attack but go farther in one respect, namely, that they frequently attack landlords because they imagine that most landlords are conservative churchmen; whereas the great majority of landlords are small men; and land has always been a popular investment with working men's societies.

In regard to restricting the consumption of intoxicating liquors, Church and Chapel are in constant alliance, because they feel that there they are on really safe ground. Churchmen like Archbishop Magee are quite extinct, and it is always popular to recommend State interference with anything that is supposed to make England either free or merry. As supernatural beliefs decline so it becomes increasingly necessary for the clergy to distract public attention from the doctrines which they are paid to preach, and to substitute for them different forms of moral discipline which are likely to edify the rich without raising any open revolt on the part of the poor. It is, however, to the credit of the Catholic Church that its leaders have never given way to any popular clamour on this subject, and that they alone in the United States have always refused to join in any movement for Prohibition.

I have before mentioned that since 1857

marriage in the United Kingdom has been free from ecclesiastical control ; but naturally the Church has desired to retain moral control even if it has lost legal control ; and as I wrote above, the two principal questions which give rise to dispute are questions connected with divorce and birth control. As regards divorce, there has been considerable variation except on the part of the Catholic Church, which has always maintained the ideal and the fiction, if not always the fact, of indissoluble marriage. This attitude is for the most part closely imitated by the Anglican Party in the Church of England. It is obviously a sign of weakness in either party to invoke the aid of the policeman when the threat of excommunication should be sufficient for the faithful. Some time ago I pointed out that the Athenæum would not prosper as a club if members could not be prevented from smoking in the drawing-room without fetching a policeman from Waterloo Place. The wiser churchmen, however, expressly disavow any right on the part of the Church as such to interfere either with the State or with the public at large. Their argument is that the Catholic ideal of indissoluble marriage is obviously so essential to the welfare of the community that it is their duty as good citizens to maintain as citizens doctrines which they imbibed as churchmen.

Nonconformists are curiously inconsistent. Thus, Presbyterians and even Episcopalians in Scotland do not appear to object to the very liberal law of divorce which has prevailed in Scotland ever since the days of John Knox ; while on the other hand, Presbyterians in Belfast and other parts of Ireland appear to suppose that divorce is highly sinful. Opinion is fairly divided among Nonconformists in England and Wales, as appears from the following letter which was addressed on the 27th September 1920, by the President and Vice-President of the Baptist Union to the editor of the journal of the Divorce Law Reform Union : —

“DEAR SIR,—In reply to your enquiry whether the Manifesto recently issued by the Archbishops and some leading Free Churchmen against the Bill for reforming the Marriage Laws is to be regarded as the official pronouncement of the churches, we can only reply for the Baptists.

“We have no knowledge of any decision upon the Bill having been made by any Committee of the Council or the Assembly. The Manifesto seems to be the view of certain officials, but in no sense an official view. The responsibility for the document rests entirely upon the gentlemen whose signatures it bears.

46 THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

“We have no doubt there is a strong body of opinion in all the churches that the laws relating to the setting aside of the marriage tie, in cases where one of the parties is hopelessly incompetent to fulfil the marriage obligation, inflicts a terrible hardship upon thousands of persons, and is a grave cause of irregular unions and illegitimacy.

“The present law creates an artificial standard of morals and weakens regard for the sacredness of marriage.

“We hold the view, which we believe is very largely held by Baptists, that the time has come for a careful revision of the laws, with proper safeguards, to remove the injustice and temptation and to bring the law of the land into closer harmony with the Divine Justice which should be the standard of all moral law. For these reasons we would support the Bill introduced by Lord Buckmaster. We are, yours sincerely,

“D. J. HILEY,

“President Baptist Union.”

“J. C. CARLILE,

“Vice-President Baptist Union.”

The truth is that most men and women do not usually reason on questions of morality but accept what they are taught in morals as

passively as what they used to accept what they were taught in religion. Church and Chapel will always defend whatever moral usages prevail in the locality where they happen to be ; and this habit is equally true of lawyers, as appeared when all the lawyers of all the American States were asked to criticise their own institutions. Nearly all the replies showed a complete satisfaction with the *status quo*, whether the State in question sanctioned a loose form of divorce or did not permit divorce at all. I might illustrate the same thesis if I collected ecclesiastical opinion on the question of legitimisation by subsequent marriage. I much doubt if the great body of Anglican opinion is in favour of this measure, though it was the Church who tried to enforce it against the will of the House of Lords in 1216 ; and I imagine that Scots Presbyterians and Irish Presbyterians would differ just because legitimisation by subsequent marriage prevails in Scotland and does not prevail in Ireland.

The question of birth control is naturally a question on which it is difficult for any clergyman to interfere with a married couple. So far as I know, the Nonconformists have wisely left it alone, while only a small section of Anglicans have publicly advocated State interference with the use of preventives. The strongest

denunciation of birth control has always come from the Catholic Church, and the Confessional obviously provides a handy weapon for enforcing its doctrines. Yet in these days the Church has had to abstain from too much interference through this channel, and has even fallen back on the illogical proposition that intercourse is permissible at certain times when it is suggested that fertilisation is less likely to occur. Why it should be permissible to interfere with a Divine purpose indirectly, though not directly, is not obvious to the lay mind; but the fact of the compromise is highly significant in any summary of the declining power of the Church in regard to the liberty of the individual believer.

The question of Sunday games affords perhaps the most striking evidence of the growing weakness of Church and Chapel. So far as I know, the Catholic Church has never interfered with Sunday games so long as its ordinary observances are not neglected. The Church of England has also inherited a certain tradition of liberty in this respect, though in the nineteenth century the Evangelical influence tended to destroy it. Until recently the Church has always discouraged lawn tennis and golf on Sunday, though it could not well interfere with Sunday walks or motor trips. It is significant,

however, that on the lawn tennis courts constructed in the burying-ground of St George's, Hanover Square, in the Bayswater Road, no one is allowed to play on Sundays.

The Nonconformists have always hotly opposed all Sunday games, and in the recent controversy about opening the London parks for Sunday games their zeal considerably outran their discretion. Neither Church nor Chapel has divulged the statistics of Church and Chapel attendance ; but one gathers that these statistics, if known, would be rather startling ; and this falling-off in attendance may well account for some of the passion which has been obvious in the recent controversy.

Church has always shown more wisdom than Chapel in shaping its policy in accordance with popular opinion on questions like birth control, the prevention of venereal disease, and Sunday games. This is probably due to the fact that the Catholic Church from earliest times has always been liberal on questions of morality as opposed to questions of belief. For moral obliquity there was at least the remedy of absolution, whereas for obstinate unbelief there was no remedy but fire on earth and fire in Hell. Nevertheless, the power of the Church in moral questions depends entirely on supernatural authority, and religion should never

be confused with moral philosophy. By supernatural authority the Church may establish a tradition of morality, and tradition is the only sound basis of any morality whether its origin be supernatural or whether it has grown up gradually like the Confucian system. The Catholic Church took over much of the morality which grew up under the Stoic philosophy in the later Roman Empire, and that tradition is the basis of most European morality.

Modern moralists should always remember that moral reforms must have the support either of faith or of reason ; but the two are not very well combined. A religion without miracles is very like a temperance drink ; but morality without reason is rather like a home-made cocktail in a country suffering from Prohibition. A man may give up the habit of drinking beer between 3 P.M. and 6 P.M. if he is persuaded to do so by Divine Revelation or by being convinced that it is bad for his health ; but if there is no Divine Revelation he will require some very strong argument to make him alter his habits ; and the mere assertion that it is immoral to drink beer as above carries no weight merely because it is made by a Clerk in Holy Orders who is unnaturally reticent on the subject of Divine Revelation. If Church and Chapel will once realise this simple truth they

will be able to devote themselves more usefully to the task of regenerating mankind, and I do not wish for a moment to minimise the good work which they have done and are doing in spite of the unfortunate manifestoes which they are occasionally induced by well-meaning persons to sign.

Putting aside all higher motives, Church and Chapel may well be invited to contemplate the unpopularity of the priest and minister, and the persecution to which it gives rise. It would appear to-day difficult for any man to walk about at night in clerical attire without being sooner or later arrested by the police if his conduct is in the slightest degree eccentric. This is perhaps symptomatic of the resentment felt by the populace after long centuries of clerical denunciation. If the thunders of Sinai have departed the still small voice is obviously the most politic vehicle of exhortation.

To-day William Blake's lines are becoming "the tune which is haunting millions of ears." I make no apology for repeating them :

" I went to the Garden of Love,
And saw what I never had seen :
A Chapel was built in the midst,
Where I used to play on the green.

52 · THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

And the gates of this Chapel were shut,
And 'Thou Shalt Not' writ over the door ;
So I turn'd to the Garden of Love
That so many sweet flowers bore ;

And I saw it was filled with graves,
And tomb-stones where flowers should be !
And Priests in black gowns were walking their
 rounds,
And binding with briars my joys and desires."

CHAPTER III

THE MODERN PURITAN

PURITANISM prevails in every community ; but it takes different forms.

There are Catholic Puritans, Protestant Puritans, and Agnostic Puritans. Whereas, however, the Puritan is a freak in Latin countries and in Russia, he is a normal type in what may roughly be called Protestant communities ; for instance, in English-speaking countries, in North Germany, and Scandinavia. He represents roughly the tendencies which Matthew Arnold called Hebraism as opposed to Hellenism. Although his ancestors insisted on the virtue of faith as against works, the faith of the modern Puritan is not in God but in a peculiar form of morality which derives in almost every instance from the ethical system of John Calvin. Catholicism has preserved the pagan theory of what roughly corresponds to Hellenism as defined by Matthew Arnold ; that is to say, it preserves a certain all-round philosophy of life which includes æsthetic and intellectual enjoyments as opposed to concen-

tration on nothing but problems of conduct. If the Catholic found that the temptations of life were too strong for him he could retreat from the world and contemplate the mysteries of the Faith, or if he were a Benedictine he could combine this contemplative activity with the cultivation of the soil. Calvin and his followers, however, founded, as Professor Ritchie has remarked, progressive and commercial commonwealths. Calvin was the first of the theologians to proclaim that usury was not of itself sinful, and his preoccupation with the Old Testament no doubt inoculated Protestantism with the Jewish theory that terrestrial and material prosperity was a noble end for mankind to pursue. The Protestant avoided the temptations of this world by absorbing himself in the pursuit of money-making, and it was dangerous for him to dally either with æsthetic or intellectual pleasures. Philosophy was part of theology and must be left exclusively to ministers and theologians. Art, music, and literature were dangerous because they gave pleasure and were also associated with the Catholic religion.

This association of Calvinism and Judaism is not entirely just to the Jews. The Jewish proletariat may be quite as utilitarian as the Gentile proletariat ; but no historian can fail

to remark the high culture of the prosperous Jew during the last three centuries as compared with the prosperous Gentile. From a purely intellectual point of view Germany would be nowhere without the German Jew, and the English Jew has encouraged English art for the last hundred years far more conspicuously and substantially than the ordinary English Gentile. Nor should it be forgotten that the American millionaire has contributed very large sums of money to American universities.

Nevertheless one must admit that Hebraism is the one ethical code and philosophy of life which is to-day common to Great Britain, North America, and all Protestant countries in Europe, and the main result is a crude Philistinism which produces mercenary love, brutish amusements, over-eating and over-drinking, and a Press which is as trivial as it is disgusting. The typical modern Englishman will not read *Romeo and Juliet* as he might have done before the Reformation; but he will gloat over the report of a murder trial or of a public execution. His whole life is given up to the struggle for economic existence, and he is too insensitive even to put cayenne pepper into his claret. He prefers methylated spirits.

The Hebraisation of England which resulted

from reading and poring over the Old Testament did not make itself felt till the middle of the seventeenth century ; but from that time onwards it has brooded like a dark cloud over the intellectual life of this country. The tradition of aristocratic patronage survived till about 1800 ; but from 1800 onwards the thinker and artist has usually lived in poverty and isolation if he had no fortune of his own. Most of the great Victorians had either some private fortune or some kind of job which as gentlemen they were not likely to lose. The Victorian age produced a fair crop of heretics ; but men like Darwin and Ruskin were rich, and others like John Stuart Mill were civil servants or had some means of subsistence apart from their work. Men like Carlyle or Spencer, who had no fortune or official employment or academic endowment, lived in abject poverty for the greater part of their lives, and even in old age were read mainly because in some way or another they satisfied the moral enthusiasm of their readers. Money-making thinkers were in fact all Hebraists with the exception of one or two writers like Swinburne, who either died in poverty or had a private fortune. All this presents a vivid contrast to France, where even in spite of democracy the great artist or writer has had a fair hearing from a community which

is interested in art and philosophy as serious pursuits in life.

The connection of these speculations with the question of liberty may not be obvious at first sight. But we must not forget that both social and political liberty have always reposed during the Christian era on the competition of Church and State for power over the individual. The Catholic Church has at times been associated with political despotism, as, for instance, under Louis XIV. in France; but she has rarely asserted her rights with any violence so long as her influence through the Confessional and other institutions has not been directly challenged. In the Protestant world, however, Calvinism has been associated with the most violent struggles for power on the part of democracy. In both hemispheres the intense individualism of the Calvinist who feels that God is always inspiring his sayings and doings, has resulted in what is called modern democracy.

Modern democracy was created in the name of liberty in order to protect the individual citizen from the tyranny of privilege; but as even Rousseau pointed out, it cannot work on a very large scale. Democracy has always been the enemy of social liberty, and it is now beginning to destroy political liberty. The concentration of all human activity on

industrial pursuits naturally fits well into industrial civilisation, and it is particularly encouraged by captains of industry. But it tends to produce a servile proletariat which loses the instinct of acquiring property or enjoying liberty. If the capitalist thinks of nothing but business he may naturally suppose that his servants should be equally absorbed in the production of wealth to the exclusion of all other distractions. Too often the wage-earner relapses into a mental condition in which he thinks of nothing but earning sufficient money to exist in a certain amount of comfort without requiring any other amenities of life except those which are provided in the form of subsidiary doles.

The super-capitalist is of course beginning to detect a certain revolt against his own existence, and he is naturally inclined to point out that he is indispensable to the industrial and economic life of any community.

My own view is that no society can dispense with the activities of the capitalist and of men who are generally denounced by Socialists as *bourgeois*. But the fact remains that they are seldom socially attractive. Their wealth would not be grudged if they were only less conspicuous and important in society. It was the power and influence of the wealthy Philistine

which roused the wrath of men as different as Matthew Arnold, William Morris, and John Ruskin, and which even to-day creates much of the anti-social feeling displayed by Communists and other social heretics. Many of these heretics are to-day quite as ready to appreciate the charming manners of the aristocrat as they are to enjoy the reassuring simplicity of the proletarian; but what they cannot endure is the smug tyranny of the profiteer. If this view of popular sentiment is correct, it is very odd to find all political parties to-day dominated by men who are for the most part the servants, or at least the close allies, of the financier. The modern politician of the Protestant world observes middle-class conventions more slavishly than anyone else. He has preserved none of the charm or spontaneity or respect for liberty that at any rate distinguished the British politician of the nineteenth century, and it is obvious that if the Labour Party had ever had the courage to adopt the political tenets of Mr Horatio Bottomley and abandoned the catchwords of the Nonconformist schoolmaster, it would have swept the country long ago. Modern Collectivism may succeed in destroying political liberty; but it cannot safely do so without restoring social liberty. The modern Puritan acquiesces in the loss of social liberty

60 . THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

because he thinks that he has political liberty in the sense of governing the country. When he really begins to find out the loss of his political liberty he will lead a general revolt against the tyranny of the modern State.

The Catholic Church has never ceased to maintain a tradition of social and individual liberty as against the State, and this seems also to apply to the Greek Church, for before 1914 there was as much social freedom in Russia as there is to-day in Latin countries. Catholic nations have certainly been indifferent to the accumulation of wealth, to efficient sanitation, and to preventive medicine; but they have always maintained a considerable amount of individual freedom in the region of private life. The lack of this tradition in Protestant communities such as the English-speaking world and North Germany, has made it much easier for the State to step into the shoes of the Church in the name of morality. The tyranny of the herd has been enormously increased by the growing efficiency of State control, especially when this control is encouraged by Church and Chapel as being righteous and by politicians as being democratic. The capitalists and the *bourgeois* class generally are becoming frightened of the proletariat and wish to keep the proletariat under strict control; while the

proletariat, having no freedom for themselves, enviously approve the destruction of a freedom which they cannot themselves enjoy. This suppression of social liberty, which is also tending, as belief in the supernatural declines, to the suppression of political liberty as well, is exceedingly dangerous to our civilisation. All the tendencies above mentioned may easily end in a class conflict in which civilisation as we know it may fall to pieces. We are losing not only the social liberty derived from aristocratic and Catholic tradition but also the political liberty of the individual which the Protestant nations have achieved through the individualism of Nonconformity. The danger is perhaps more apparent on the other side of the Atlantic. A nation may survive great social changes ; but I find it difficult to believe that any community can long continue in which men are not only prevented from consuming fermented liquors but are also sterilised by the State physician.

The succeeding chapters of this book deal with many different subjects ; but in the last resort these subjects are no more than different phases of the corrosive warfare between Catholicism and Calvinism, Hellenism and Hebraism, Individualism and Collectivism.

CHAPTER IV

THE COLLECTIVIST¹

IT is at times rather difficult to distinguish the Collectivist from the Communist ; but generally speaking, the Collectivist seems more inclined to work on Fabian lines and less inclined to explode society at short notice. So far as I know, there are comparatively few Communists in England ; but there have been plenty of Collectivists since 1880. Communism is as old as the world ; but the peculiar quality of Collectivism is that it was made in Germany and became the religion of the State. Germany is a country which seems destined to be ruled in peace by Collectivists and in war by war-lords ; but there is not much practical difference between the two systems so far as the details of individual life are concerned. Socialism as portrayed by its exponents closely resembles life in barracks.

The Socialist has always in the first place attacked the institution of private property and the acquisition of wealth, for he maintains

¹ With Appendix by Mr Arnold Lupton, p. 159.

that all property and all wealth are based on the exploitation of others. In an imperfect world it cannot be denied that it is impossible to acquire certain kinds of wealth without exploiting a certain number of individuals; but one may perhaps prefer a system under which the exploitation is 25 per cent. and not 95 per cent. In any case this doctrine appealed to the prosperous benevolence of those who were fortunate enough to live during the thirty years which preceded the Great War; for the teeming prosperity of that era allowed a considerable number of men and women to indulge in Utopian visions. These men and women also enjoyed seeing municipal life humanised by bands in the park and other municipal amenities. They did not understand, however, the extent to which municipal faddists were either consciously or unconsciously creating monopolies for their friends, as for example, tram contractors, or generally exploiting public resources. It would in fact have been difficult for anyone to detect all this without devoting a considerable amount of time and labour to elaborate research on the subject, and this is almost impossible for a private citizen who has to earn his living. Mr Herbert Spencer did his best but was only condemned as a faddist by the men who were busily constructing a

64 THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

system of despotic extortion at the expense of their more industrious fellow-creatures. Mr W. H. Mallock did some valuable work on these lines but it has not made much impression on the public.

The Collectivist was at first wise enough to restrain his contempt for liberty. If he attacked liberty at all it was usually in the case of small shopkeepers and other persons who were supposed not to matter because they were grit in the wheels of big business ; but in fact he did object to anything which interfered with what I have called compulsory social welfare ; for compulsory social welfare was essential to the Collectivist gratifying his own lust for power. Perhaps I may here remark that the lust for power in the sense of tyranny over masses of individuals has been much neglected as a human motive by historians and particularly by economists. In our own time we can see many persons, such as Russian Jews, decayed county magnates, inefficient artisans, and many other persons who have failed in ordinary life, obsessed with the idea of ruling society by controlling certain essential levers in the social machinery. Yet it is not difficult to see that even if the plutocrat, unaided by the Collectivist as he is now, were as free to exploit society as the Collectivist asserts,

his exploitation would be a much lesser evil than the wholesale exploitation of society by the quasi-military or industrial form of conscription that the Collectivist advocates. For the plutocrat can at least be partially controlled by taxation and other measures of State.

It must not be forgotten that compulsory social welfare is tyrannical and capricious exactly in so far as it exceeds the limits of obvious necessity. I have mentioned vaccination and public education as examples of beneficent State interference ; but I have no doubt that if once compulsory social welfare had become firmly established in this country the textile industries would get a hearing from the Government and we should all be compelled to wear digitated socks or stockings on pain of a heavy fine.

It is not too much to say that no Collectivist Government would express any general will except the general will to inertia. This would merely result in a four-hours working day, on which no country can possibly exist unless or until Collectivism becomes international and universal and a strict system of birth control is universally enforced. Even then it is doubtful if production would be sufficient ; but supposing it were I do not believe that ninety per cent. of the population would ever do any public work in the leisure which they had

acquired. Authors like Mr William Morris and Mr H. G. Wells seem to imagine that this leisure would be spent at the National Gallery or at the British Museum or in the enjoyment of fine scenery and good music. I find this difficult to believe ; but perhaps the development of better communications with the Soviet Government in Russia will prove that I am mistaken. In any case I find it difficult to believe that the great mass of the population will be at all interested in such questions as the compulsory wearing of the digitated sock, which I take as a typical example of compulsory social welfare.

The attack on liberty appears in almost every item of the existing Collectivist programme. They are not honest enough to propose the nationalisation of land by purchase ; they only desire to make the ownership of land intolerable by fantastic proposals. If a land-owner, big or small, is unable or unwilling to build a house on his land which no one in his senses is likely to buy, he is to be taxed to such an extent that he will be only too ready to make over the land to the State or to any squatter who may be encouraged by the State to complete this process of confiscation. Endless ministries will be created, as they were in Mr Lloyd George's palmy days, and the private citizen will be

dragooned in the same proportion as he is robbed by those whom he is foolish enough to entrust with public authority.

When once all these gentry are firmly in the saddle we should by now know what to expect. During the War a number of bureaucrats were let loose and did exactly as they liked at the expense of the public. They were only brought to book in the years that immediately followed the Armistice by the Judges, who suddenly woke up to the fact that the law of this country provided for the control of officials and had to be duly administered. Nevertheless, we have in our midst frequent examples of how power is abused where the victim is supposed to be incapable of resistance. The first example I shall take is that of lunacy administration.

Theoretically the Lunacy Act 1890 provides quite adequate safeguards, on paper, against the ordinary citizen being wrongly certified as a lunatic ; but in practice there is not much real security either for rich or poor. The rich man or woman is fairly safe in the case of a happy marriage ; but where there is an unhappy marriage a husband or wife who wishes to get the other spouse certified need not have much difficulty in certain circumstances.

Even where a person has obviously been the victim of disgraceful trickery, and where the

doctor who keeps the asylum is anxious to put matters right, the scandal is pretty sure not to be exposed. It is not unknown for a victim in such a case to be requested to make his or her escape for fourteen days so as to save the face of the doctors who either foolishly or wickedly lent themselves to the nefarious intentions of the petitioner.

A poor citizen is to-day about as safe from certification as a savage in certain tribes is safe from being denounced for black magic. Any policeman can take a poor person to a work-house and there have him or her put in the infirmary for observation. After the process which is called observation and a certificate by a doctor, a Chairman of Guardians can make a reception order.

The monstrous abuses of this system were well exposed in the case of *Everett v. Griffiths and Another*. When Lord Reading sat on the case as Lord Chief Justice he said that the plaintiff had no remedy against the officer who made the reception order because making the order was a judicial act, and therefore conferred on him judicial immunity. This doctrine in the end prevailed against the plaintiff, who obtained no redress though he carried the case up to the House of Lords.

Lord Justice Atkin delivered a dissenting

judgment in the Court of Appeal, in which he maintained that the reception order was an administrative and not a judicial act in consequence of which the officer could be impeached in respect of the order. He urged that even though a poor person was only what the law calls a volunteer and had not the same rights against the doctor as if he were a patient, yet the doctor had to exercise what is known as good faith and reasonable care in making any report which justified a reception order. The learned judge contended that neither the officer nor the doctor in this particular case took sufficient pains to justify them in condemning the plaintiff to incarceration in a lunatic asylum; and I should have thought that anyone who read the law reports would agree with this opinion.

I am not here concerned with the grievances of Mr Everett, and I may here mention that I have no particular reason to vindicate his sanity, for in a recent pamphlet on the subject he denounces Lord Haldane as supporting a bill which I drafted as "a bill to legalise vice." I mention his case simply because it seems to me a capital instance of the danger to which the liberty of any individual citizen is exposed when once the safety of the official is regarded as paramount to the rights of the individual

citizen. In the light of the facts which are at last being made public in regard to certification and in regard to the neglect of any system of classification in many lunatic asylums, I think it not unfair to assert that under any Collectivist State the ordinary citizen would find himself as much at the mercy of the ordinary State official as a man suffering from mild nervous disease is to-day at the mercy of the magistrate and the doctors. The whole problem is now complicated by the machinery which has been invented for the detention of persons who are known as mental defectives. Gross abuses are likely to occur, and there have been most unpleasant rumours of young persons taken away from their parents and released from institutions for purposes of domestic service at a sweated wage. Possibly sterilisation by a State doctor is less inhuman than what is going on now; but probably there are even to-day some Individualists left who dislike a State doctor being entrusted with any final decision in a matter which so vitally affects the individual citizen, and which is quite incongruous with any political theory except the theory of the Servile State.

Recent events are not reassuring in regard to the police. It may be merely a coincidence but it is remarkable how common the abuse

of police power became during the closing years of the War. The police seem too frequently to forget that their duty is to preserve public order and not merely to pile up a list of convictions. Yet it has been publicly admitted that policemen obtain promotion by securing convictions, and it cannot be denied that in recent years the police have levied a systematic blackmail on prostitutes and other persons who are not in a position to complain. Most of these abuses were exposed after the arrest of Sir Almeric FitzRoy and his successful appeal from the sentence of a magistrate who had long been conspicuous for the credulity which he displayed in regard to uncorroborated police evidence. Sir Almeric's conviction occurred in the autumn of 1922; but even in the early part of that year there had been frequent examples of appeals from magistrates being successful. In February 1922 several successful appeals were made to the London Sessions, and even the magistrate who sentenced Sir Almeric had in February refused to convict a man who was accused by two constables whose evidence was inconsistent.

I should not like to suggest that the British policeman has been more demoralised than other State officials either in this country or elsewhere. Much, for instance, might be said

about the most expensive activities of the King's Proctor and his myrmidons in matters of divorce, but much more about the gross tyranny of American officials in regard to Immigration and Prohibition. There is, however, no advantage to be gained by labouring an obvious point. I have chosen the above-mentioned examples merely to emphasise the danger of Collectivist doctrines to liberty. Even if the aristocrat or plutocrat tyrannised over the community as much as the Collectivist asserts, the poor citizen has at least some right of appeal to the State, however imperfect it may be; while on the other hand, it is fairly clear that in the Collectivist State the official will be a law unto himself or herself.

Perhaps I may be pardoned for concluding this chapter with a few words from Mr G. K. Chesterton in regard to Prussianism. It may be said that there were a few sporadic thinkers like Robert Owen who existed long before the growth of modern Germany; but it cannot be contested that the whole inspiration of the modern Socialist in this and other countries has come from Germany, and that most of our recent social legislation has been borrowed from Berlin. I hope at any rate that any supporter of Collectivism will at least consider Mr Chesterton's warning before finally making up

his mind on the subject. The passage to which I refer runs as follows¹ :—

“ There was a province of Europe which had carried nearer to perfection than any other the type of order and foresight that are the subject of this book. It had long been the model State of all those more rational moralists who saw in science the ordered salvation of society. It was admittedly ahead of all other States in social reform. All the systematic social reforms were professedly and proudly borrowed from it. Therefore when this province of Prussia found it convenient to extend its imperial system to the neighbouring and neutral State of Belgium, all these scientific enthusiasts had a privilege not always granted to mere theorists. They had the gratification of seeing their great Utopia at work, on a grand scale and very close at hand. They had not to wait, like other evolutionary idealists, for the slow approach of something nearer to their dreams ; or to leave it merely as a promise to posterity. They had not to wait for it as for a distant thing like the vision of a future state ; but in the flesh they had seen their Paradise. And they were very silent for five years.

“ The thing died at last, and the stench of it

¹ The last pages of *Eugenics and Other Evils*.

stank to the sky. It might be thought that so terrible a savour would never altogether leave the memories of men; but men's memories are unstable things. It may be that gradually these dazed dupes will gather again together, and attempt again to believe their dreams and disbelieve their eyes. There may be some whose love of slavery is so ideal and disinterested that they are loyal to it even in its defeat. Wherever a fragment of that broken chain is found, they will be found hugging it. But there are limits set in the everlasting mercy to him who has been once deceived and a second time deceives himself. They have seen their paragons of science and organisation playing their part on land and sea; showing their love of learning at Louvain and their love of humanity at Lille. For a time at least they have believed the testimony of their senses. And if they do not believe now, neither would they believe though one rose from the dead; though all the millions who died to destroy Prussianism stood up and testified against it."

CHAPTER V

THE COMMUNIST

THE word "communism" may include a number of ideals; but the only ideal of that kind which would appeal to me would be that defined by Mr Bertrand Russell in his *Roads to Freedom* :

"The glorification of the State, and the doctrine that it is every citizen's duty to serve the State, are radically against progress and against liberty. The State, though at present a source of much evil, is also a means to certain good things, and will be needed so long as violent and destructive impulses remain common. But it is *merely* a means, and a means which needs to be very carefully and sparingly used if it is not to do more harm than good. It is not the State, but the community, the world-wide community of all human beings present and future, that we ought to serve. And a good community does not spring from the glory of the State, but from the unfettered development of individuals: from happiness

in daily life, from congenial work giving opportunity for whatever constructiveness each man or woman may possess, from free personal relations embodying love and taking away the roots of envy in thwarted capacity for affection, and above all from the joy of life and its expression in the spontaneous creations of art and science. It is these things that make an age or a nation worthy of existence, and these things are not to be secured by bowing down before the State. It is the individual in whom all that is good must be realized, and the free growth of the individual must be the supreme end of a political system which is to re-fashion the world.”¹

In contrast to this, Mr John Pollock in his book, *The Bolshevik Adventure*,² quotes the old motto, “What is a Communist? One who is willing to put down his penny and take up your shilling.” The disconcerting feature of all Communism to-day is that it professes to be based on the doctrines of Karl Marx and is in fact based on and subsidised by the Bolshevik Party in Russia. Unfortunately, the sense of property in Russia is, as Mr Pollock remarks, rudimentary.

“In Little Russia, now often called the

¹ *Roads to Freedom*, p. 145. George Allen & Unwin.

² *The Bolshevik Adventure*, p. 111. Constable & Co., London, 1921.

Ukraine, and in the Baltic provinces, personal ownership of land existed, but in Great Russia land belonged solely to the village community, and the individual had only a passing interest in it common to all the members of his community. This system guaranteed a minimum return for labour, and a maximum development of sloth, ignorance, and apathy, since a man's well-tilled land might be taken from him and given to another, he thus losing the fruits of industry and perseverance. Only with the land reforms of Stolypin did a glimmering of what Arthur Young called 'the magic of property' begin to illumine his darkness. Time, however, was too short, and the shock of Socialist propaganda struck Russia before the peasants had emerged from their primitive communal State. Thus immemorial tradition inclined them to a ready acceptance of communistic ideas, especially when accompanied by a lavish distribution of German gifts in money and kind, and the profitable possibility of selling Russian guns to the enemy. Not until the results of Communism began to be seen in practice did their eyes open and their minds change."

It is of course notorious that Communism is as old as the village community, well known to students of Sir Henry Maine's *Ancient Law*

and to those who are familiar with the customs of the mediæval manor. The mediæval manor presents, a peculiar paradox which is not familiar to modern Collectivists. All efficiency in the cultivation of land is sacrificed to equality of possession, so that both the best and the worst land is divided into infinitesimal strips or allotments which can only be cultivated with difficulty by peasants who sacrifice the interests of agriculture to the pacification of individual jealousy. As civilisation progresses there is a wider life than that of the peasant, and urban competition leaps beyond the grooves of the village community. But even outside the village community there have always been many persons who cannot endure the struggle for existence as expressed in any sense of individual responsibility. The type is well marked in our own day. It is represented by the type of man or woman who dare not adventure on marriage without very substantial financial guarantees, and very often abjures marriage altogether. To-day one may come across many men who prefer to be either monks or soldiers, and there are many women who prefer either to become nuns or to live on an annuity without having to exert themselves in any particular manner.

The whole point about Communism is that it

is not a creation of the community. The Communist Manifesto, published by The Executive Communist Party of Great Britain, is quite misleading on this point. It is quite honest in advertising revolution and in opposing every expenditure of the Government on Army, Navy, or Police because this expenditure organises repression of the workers; but it does not reveal the absolute necessity of what the modern Communist calls "the iron law of oligarchy." This principle is common to all Communist organisations, from Plato's Republic downwards. The stability of Plato's Republic depends entirely on a class of Guardians, who are trusted to such an extent that they are allowed to manipulate the ballot on which the procreation of Platonic infants depends.

The same feature was essential to the Oneida Community. I once met the son of the man who founded this Community, and he told me that he was born as the result of an application by his father and mother to the official tribunal to be allowed to have a child. This tribunal was of course a pure oligarchy, and had power to separate the parents directly pregnancy occurred. This community of men and women shared out all women and all property until some sort of revolution occurred, and it has ended in being one of the largest chain-making

concerns in the United States, though marriage and property have now become recognised as necessary evils. The same system of privileged oligarchy is portrayed in Mr H. G. Wells's *Modern Utopia*. The paraphrase "voluntary nobility" is reinforced by Mr Wells's appeal to the Japanese Samurai; but I fancy that the magic of the Samurai is in part due to their remoteness from the Occidental world. It is perhaps a little disconcerting to find his idea enthusiastically adopted by Eden and Cedar Paul in a book entitled *Creative Revolution*,¹ which is dedicated to Lenin. They ask, "Who can doubt that Trotsky is one of the most efficient army organisers that ever lived; that this remarkable anti-militarist feels an abiding delight in the making and management of the famous Red Army? And who can doubt that Lenin and Buharin and the Lunacharskys are all persons who secure a supremely congenial mode of self-expression in their task of large-scale manipulation of man the social being; in their work of modifying the plastic social environment, the very stuff and substance of which man the social being (as contrasted with man the biological type) is made?"

The authors of this book, to whom I shall

¹ *Creative Revolution*, p. 155, by Eden and Cedar Paul. George Allen & Unwin, London, 1920.

hereafter refer for convenience as "The Pauls," suffer from an incapacity for writing the English language which is probably due to their immersion in German philosophy. Words like "confusionism" are commonly used; their sentences are inverted, and they use many words which are unfamiliar to the ordinary student of the English language. So far, however, as their language can be understood, they are quite explicit in regard to the machinery of Communism, and they explain that the inevitable oligarchy is to be one of Communist ergatocracy as opposed to "ownership rule." It is gratifying to learn that they are sufficiently acquainted with the Greek language to explain that "ergates" is the Greek word for "worker." Democracy as the rule of the people is to make way for ergatocracy, the rule of the worker. What the rule of the worker means is explained quite fully in the chapter on the dictatorship of the proletariat. Ergatocracy will unquestionably signify "workers' rule"; "there will have to be a highly centralised governmental authority exercising *rule* in the strictest sense. As to the distinction between Socialism and Communism, we are told that it was underlined "in March 1919, when the Third International was founded at Moscow." ¹ Socialism,

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

we are informed, "is to-day pink, semi-bourgeois, and respectable; Communism is red, proletarian, disreputable, and Bolshevik." The miserable Socialist is accused of the crime of believing in parliamentary action; while the Communist is to obtain all that he wants by revolution and proletarian dictatorship.¹

The Pauls reserve much of their wrath for Ruskin College and the Workers' Educational Association. These bodies are damned for what the Pauls in their odd jargon call "a social solidarity trend."² This phrase amuses me because I delivered one of the first lectures to Ruskin College when it was founded in Oxford. I remember that the lecture was on the subject of the Reformation, and that while I was absorbed in explaining the distinction between the Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrines of predestination I was suddenly interrupted and asked to tell the audience what I thought about payment of members. I give this incident for what it is worth as an example of the social solidarity trend which appears so menacing in its social consequences to the Pauls.

The ordinary European of to-day would imagine that the general taste for violence had been well indulged in the last decade, and even in the present day. The Pauls, however, in

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

spite of a professed desire for peaceful revolution, revel in the intoxicating phrases of Lenin and Trotsky. They quote a passage written in 1914 by Trotsky which runs as follows :—
“The revolutionary epoch will create new forms of organisation out of the inexhaustible resources of working-class Socialism; new forms that will be equal to the greatness of the new tasks. To this work we will apply ourselves at once, amid the rattling of the machine-guns, the crashing of cathedrals, and the howling of the jackals of capitalism. Amid this hellish orchestra of death we will keep our minds clear, our vision undimmed. We feel that we ourselves are the only creative force of the future. Already there are more of us than it may seem. To-morrow there will be more of us than to-day. And the day after to-morrow millions will rise up under our banner, millions who even now, six to seven years after the publication of the Communist Manifesto, have nothing to lose but their chains.”¹ I ought perhaps to explain that this Communist Manifesto is not that published by the Communists in the British House of Commons to-day; but the Sacred Gospel of War published by Karl Marx in 1848.

According to the Pauls, the Soviet in Russia

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 91.

is a council of workers' delegates. They explain that in this country the corresponding body is commonly known as a Workers' Committee. I know nothing about any Workers' Committees; but Mr Pollock describes the Councils as follows¹:—

“The Councils or Soviets are not elected in any sense known to respectable States. Lists of candidates are prepared beforehand and presented to be voted *en bloc* by the meetings of the factories or country districts. Anybody objecting or wishing to propose other candidates is browbeaten, bullied, and shouted down, or if the matter should go as far as organised opposition, Red Guards can be called in to suppress it. Besides, as voting is not by ballot, objectors can be noted and dealt with quietly afterwards. The Congress of Councils, an assembly of representatives from the latter which has now come together nine times and is represented as a sort of parliament, meets when summoned by the bosses of the machine, and sits for scarcely more than a few days. Its business is listening to speeches by the People's Commissars and endorsing their policy. Since its members are dependent for their salaries upon the Councils and the latter are

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 117.

amenable in a high degree to pressure from headquarters, it can be imagined how independent is their criticism. It has no legislative authority nor any control over the executive, and is merely an ornament, if anything Bolshevik can be held to serve so elegant a purpose. The People's Commissars are not responsible to the Congress, and are uncontrolled by it or by anyone else. Originally self-nominated, they remain as they began, usurpers of the name and dignity of representatives of the people. The Central Executive Committee of the Councils of Workmen's, Peasants', and Red Army Men's Deputies is in its active relation towards the People's Commissars merely a consultative body, and executive only of their will. All important appointments are made by the Council of People's Commissars or by the small groups within it that deal in patronage as a ware that constitutes one of the surest of political weapons. These groups do not always agree with one another, but, like the good Israelite organisers that the Bolshevik bosses are, they understand the necessity of holding in the main together and presenting a united front to the enemy. So close a grip is kept over the distribution of jobs that, to obtain work even in non-political institutions like the post-office or the railways, the applicant

must be provided with recommendations from two members of the Communist Party, who are themselves certified by cards issued by that party. The Bolsheviks' control over every department of life was by the end of 1918 so complete that there can hardly have been a single person earning a salary in Russia who was not directly or indirectly under their thumb, so that, were it desirable, they could at a moment's notice get him discharged. Nor is it possible to blame those who serve the Bolsheviks. They do so against their will and with hearts of lead. They must either serve or starve."

The Pauls are particularly pleased with the Soviet Council because "*they will combine executive with legislative functions. They will carry out work in addition to deciding how it ought to be done.*" This eulogy is quite typical of the general crudity which distinguishes the combination of Teutonic "confusionism" with Russian barbarism. All the most delicate adjustments of political machinery achieved by human experience are thrown into the gutter by these self-complacent statesmen. There may be a type of modern Communist who merely desires to encourage and found small communal groups of the monastic type, and he

can in no sense be called an enemy of liberty. There can be no reason why men and women should not live as they like, and the persecution of Holy Orders by the French Government in 1901 was not at all creditable to France. But obviously Lenin and Trotsky and the Pauls and all the other pundits who are propagating what is to-day known as Communism are not merely the enemies of liberty but also the enemies of the human race. There may perhaps be certain persons, as, for example, the Pauls, who are so constituted that they honestly believe in the pretensions of the Soviet Government; but there is no question that Lenin and Trotsky are treasonable adventurers of the lowest type.

Lenin and Trotsky betrayed their country for German money, and have only maintained their power by obtaining control of the Russian Army and of all the communications which are so important in a huge, unpopulated country like Russia. They have successfully appealed to all the Russian instincts of local government coupled with the Russian hatred of the middle class. Roughly speaking, it is true to say that nineteenth-century Russia had no middle class, and even in this century the principal charm of the Russian people was a combination of the polished manners of an aristocracy with the

88 . THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

naïve, child-like amiability of an illiterate populace. The manners of the *bourgeois* are often quite disagreeable; but it is very difficult to dispense with the *bourgeois*; for in the same sense as religion is a collateral security for virtue, so the existence of the *bourgeois* is a collateral security for social honesty and independence, and therefore for individual liberty against the menace of Communist ergatocracy, which means nothing more than the exploitation of 95 per cent. of the population by the remaining 5 per cent., who are for the most part criminals and without exception manufacturers of hot air.

It is to-day impossible to ascertain exactly what is happening in Russia. But it is at least reassuring to remember that the sincere Communist represents nothing but the urban proletariat and cannot achieve victory without suppressing the peasant proprietor. The peasant proprietor stands for liberty, because he insists on maintaining the family as the social unit, and the institution of the family involves the institution of property.

Even more than the peasant, it is the woman who in every rank of life represents the principle of the institution of the family. Women are practical, and so long as they are allowed by

the Communist to retain their ovaries for communal convenience, they stand for common sense as opposed to Communism. Freaks like Rosa Luxemburg are fortunately exceptional. But it is significant that one of the chief objects of the Communist is to enforce the communal ownership of women by men. To enforce possession of a person as if the person were a chattel is only too characteristic of Communist crudity ; but he forgets that the world depends on the peasant for food, and although the Communist may compel many kinds of labour, he cannot plough a field by planting a machine-gun on it or in it. The world depends on the peasant for its food supply, and on the woman for the possibility of continuous existence. If the Communist annihilated either peasants or women he would soon find an empty planet, and one would suppose that this lunacy would be obvious to all the world, if one did not occasionally read newspaper paragraphs describing in detail the latest activities of the Communist Party, who appear to take their orders from persons vaguely referred to as "Continental leaders," "The Inner Council of Nine," and Mr Saklatvala, the Parsee Member of Parliament for a division of Battersea. The activities of the party appear to include the publication of a journal known as *The Workers'*

Weekly and what is called "A Big Push for the Workers' Sports' Movement." Whether the Workers' Sports' Movement includes the activities of the hunger-marchers, who are apparently subsidised by the Communists, is not clearly stated. It is, however, obvious that all this lunacy is extremely well subsidised either from Russian or German sources.

The Communists appear to be imitating in this respect the activities of the International Labour Organisation at Geneva as to which *The Daily Gazette*¹ published on the 2nd April 1923 the following letter from Mr Noel Inchcape :—

A SERVILE STATE

To the Editor of the Daily Gazette

SIR,—One of the latest activities of the International Labour Organisation at Geneva would be incredible if it were not true. This extraordinary body, which covered itself with ridicule in 1921 by trying to impose vexatious and impracticable regulations upon agriculture and other industries, has now placed on its agenda for the next Labour Conference in Geneva the consideration of "measures for utilising the leisure hours" which the workers have gained by the adoption of the eight-hours day !

¹ A newspaper of great merit published in Exeter.

Not content with projects for restricting the initiative and freedom of action of the individual in his occupation, these modern wise men of Gotham are fired with ambition to regulate the workers' leisure moments. Is it conceivable that the British working-man will entrust to this group of international cranks the right of dictating how he shall spend his "off" time—40 minutes for Swedish exercises, a 10-minutes romp with the children, an hour on the allotment, and half-an-hour for a walk with "the missus"—with, presumably, an international inspector leaning over the gate to see that the Labour Organisation's schedule is strictly adhered to?

It seems ineffably ridiculous. Yet, apparently, the ultimate aim of many of the well-meaning but misguided people who are influencing the action of such bodies is to turn the world into a vast boarding school and hydro-pathic establishment, wherein every hour is mapped out in such a manner as they believe to be conducive to the physical and moral well-being of the individual.

Could anything be farther from the Englishman's ideal of life, or more truly typify the servile state? But, unless the working-man wishes to find his freedom curtailed by insidious inroads, he will be well advised to watch

92 THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

closely the International Labour Conference
and see that his birthright of liberty is not sold
for a mess of Genevan pottage. Yours truly,
NOEL INCHCAPE.

AUTHORS' CLUB,
2 Whitehall Court, S.W.1.

CHAPTER VI

THE PROHIBITIONIST

THE assumption of the Prohibitionist is that what he calls alcohol, including in that term all beer and wine as well as spirits, is calculated to destroy the efficiency of the citizen as much as cocaine or morphia. In ancient history the citizen had a certain liberty to commit suicide but was bound to render military service to the State ; while in mediæval Europe the citizen was bound to render feudal service to his lord but was not allowed by the Church to commit suicide. In modern times the exigencies of military service have been to some extent eclipsed by the demands of industrial civilisation, so that the principal justification for Prohibition in North America has been the alleged efficiency of workmen who took no alcohol.

I suppose that in a less imperfect world where every citizen had a little property of his own it would be admitted that every man had an indefeasible right to determine whether he would be efficient or not, for that right logically follows

on the right to suicide, which obviously cannot be contested except either as a sin against God or a default in respect of the rights owed by an individual to the community. I cannot exclude the obligation of every individual to provide for his wife and children or for his parents and other relations so long as the modern State takes upon itself the burden of protecting every citizen against starvation. I start, therefore, with the assumption that if the Prohibitionist could demonstrate that what he calls alcohol had the same pernicious effects as cocaine or morphia he could make out a strong case for what is known as Prohibition. But I maintain that fermented liquors are in most parts of the world and at any rate in Europe a necessary part of human diet, and that in countries where Prohibition is enforced there is an interference with other personal habits which excludes the Prohibitionist from being able to maintain that his campaign against alcohol is comparable with the campaign against cocaine and morphia. I have never been able to obtain sufficient information as to the facts to decide whether the Occidental crusade against the use of opium in China is justified or not. The Chinese seem to differ as much about the use of opium as Americans differ about the use of alcohol; but my one

guiding principle would be to let the Chinese decide for themselves exactly what regulations should be made, and to use those regulations as a test of the vigilance that a London policeman should exert in regard to the consumption of opium by Chinamen in East London.

We have to start with the fact that the whole controversy about alcohol has the same fanaticism as a religious controversy. In very dry regions, such as North America and Arabia and India, it appears to become a sort of religious duty to abstain from consuming fermented liquors, and even such drinks as tea and coffee appear to incur the disapproval of the man or men who wrote *The Thousand and One Nights*. The sensible man in these regions appears to eat Turkish Delight and to drink sherbet, and one hears nothing of the private stills which exist in the modern American home. It is of course difficult to understand why the modern American is always manufacturing fermented liquors for his own consumption if the climate really makes them into dangerous drugs ; but that is a matter with which I cannot deal owing to lack of knowledge. All I do know is that in the East the old injunctions of the Prophet against the use of alcohol have been on the whole respected.

I do, however, maintain that it is absurd for

anyone to assert that beer and wine are poisonous drugs for the modern European. It might be argued that in houses where food was ideally cooked the human being could derive all the sugar that he wanted from sweets, just as Dr Saleeby invokes the populace to eat toffee instead of drinking beer; and, as an American journal once remarked, no human legislation can prevent the human stomach from converting sugar into alcohol. The case for Prohibition is of course strengthened by the abominable adulteration of beer and wine that has occurred since the outbreak of war. Nevertheless, the experience of Latin countries in Europe, where good cooking exists in the poorest home and drunkenness is very rare if not unknown, is that the moderate consumption of wine is essential to the proper nutrition of the human being; and even the beer and wines obtainable in the United Kingdom are on the whole more fortifying and less poisonous than much of the adulterated and badly cooked food which is to be found in every popular restaurant and in too many inefficient homes.

Even in the United States Prohibition has resulted in a steady rise in the consumption of methylated spirits and of wood alcohol, the result of which is seen in the increase of blindness and of crime. There prevails in this

country a blank ignorance of the methods by which Prohibition was obtained in the United States. It is said that many Senators and Representatives were efficiently blackmailed into conceding their votes, and there is of course a considerable amount of hypocrisy in regard to questions of so-called morality, which, although offensive enough in the United Kingdom, is nothing as compared with what prevails in Canada and the United States. There was also, however, another potent factor, namely, the narrowing down of the "wet" areas. In any country where any considerable amount of drunkenness exists creating a "dry" area inevitably results in the overcrowding of the adjacent "wet" area; so that the accumulation of drunkards in the "wet" area gives support to the "dry" party in that area. There is also no doubt that the multiplication of restrictions creates a demand for drink which would not exist in an atmosphere of complete liberty where everyone could drink as much or as little as he pleased.

I have not, and I doubt if anyone has, the necessary information to examine the result of Prohibition in Russia. But I happened to be in Petrograd shortly before the War, and I saw not the least sign of dipsomania in the population.

I am not in the habit of consuming vodka in this country; but I did not find that drinking it in Russia was in the least injurious, although I am certain that I, in common with the whole population, consumed far more tea than was strictly compatible with nervous stability. I have not been able to find any book which dealt adequately with this question, and I am therefore compelled to confine most of my observations to the information which I have been able to gather concerning the U.S.A. I have not travelled there since the year 1899, and I have therefore asked my friend Mr A. P. Herbert, who has quite recently visited the country, to embody his impressions in an appendix to this chapter.

My belief about the United States is that Prohibition is only one symptom of a Puritanism which interferes with liberty in many other ways and which has linked itself on to the doctrines of what Mr Belloc calls The Servile State. It is of course very noble to emancipate a number of black men *if* you concede to them the rights of citizens and refrain from enslaving a number of white adults and children for the purposes of industrial civilisation. I do not like to be Pharisaical about other countries, and I fully admit that there is much hypocrisy in the United Kingdom; but I am convinced

that the United States of to-day embody all the worst traditions of Puritanism, because they combine all the Puritan contempt for individual liberty with the enthusiasm of the business man for the exploitation of weak and helpless human beings. It must of course be remembered that the average American and Canadian drinks far more whisky than anything else. Of beer and wine he knows little, although there used to be excellent beer and wine in the United States. The German-American made excellent beer, and there were very good vines in California. According to my memory of the United States, there was more public consumption of spirits and also more drunkenness than in any country which I have ever seen. There has always been a certain amount of drunkenness in Scotland since the days when small beer was abolished by the taxation of the Napoleonic Wars; but in no country except the United States have I ever seen men perpetually drinking raw spirit out of flasks in railway-carriages; and I am quite certain that in no other country would it have been possible for me to see, as I did see in a Turkish Bath at Washington in November 1899, the spectacle of three Senators rolling and vomiting about the premises. It is perhaps not surprising that this spectacle has always come

100 THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

back to my mind whenever I hear American denunciations of England as the home of drunkenness.

It is not as if Prohibition were any remedy for this state of things. I imagine that if I were to return to Washington to-day I might find thirty Senators in the same Turkish Bath instead of the three whom I saw nearly twenty-five years ago. I should have thought that nearly everyone in this country except Lady Astor and a few cranks would admit that Prohibition creates nothing but every sort of anarchy and hypocrisy, just because it suppresses every human impulse that makes for law and liberty. It is remarkable that the transatlantic Puritan has been so intoxicated by success in Prohibition that he, and especially she, is now threatening the consumption of cigarettes and chocolates, as well as the cut of certain clothes and the use of face powder. In New York City the public discussion of important problems like birth control is suppressed by the police, and I think it may*confidently be said that far more crimes are committed in the United States to-day than were committed before Prohibition became an accomplished fact.

I may perhaps be pardoned for reminding my readers of the fact that sexual intercourse

between unmarried persons is still a crime in many American States, and that in many of the States the sterilisation of certain citizens is enforced by law. In one State the exposition of Evolution as propounded by Darwin in 1859 escaped condemnation by a majority of one ; and I need hardly say that in most of the States any wholesome discussion of sex problems is a matter for prosecution. I do not wish to single out the Prohibitionist for special denunciation ; but I consider that I am justified in arguing that Archbishop Magee was perfectly right when he maintained that universal freedom was more important than individual sobriety, and that if the Prohibitionist is once allowed to have his way there will be an end to individual liberty in every other department of human life.

CHAPTER VII

THE PRUDE

THERE are various kinds of prudery, resulting from different causes. The first kind results from a certain disharmony between the natural and conventional man. I remember a man who made it a hobby on his holidays to get up at five o'clock in the morning and to go down to a little cove by the sea where he discovered that young men sometimes concealed themselves in order to see young women bathe. Having derived whatever gratification he could obtain from the disrobing of the young women, he would then rush out at the young men and threaten them with various pains and penalties for their behaviour. After breakfast and for the rest of the day he would derive sanctimonious pleasure from recounting his chivalrous exploits.

I have chosen this particular example because it illustrates very well the desire of some of our most respectable citizens to indulge the natural and the conventional man at the same time. It

is perhaps less common nowadays than it used to be to hear scandal talked by respectable persons who would preface their remarks by deprecating the ill-nature of those who said that Mrs A. saw too much of Mr B.; but one can still often hear a good deal of conversation about social reform which indicates that it is a convenient outlet for conversation which social reformers prefer to suppress in the home circle.

However, I need not enlarge on this type, as it has been delineated once and for all by M. Anatole France in the person of M. Nicodème in *Les Opinions de M. Jérôme Coignard*:

“ Je dois, reprit le vieillard, vous dire qui je suis. Vous voyez devant vous M. Nicodème, président de la compagnie de la pudeur. Le but que je poursuis est de renchérir de délicatesse, à l'endroit de la modestie, sur les règlements de M. le lieutenant de police. Je m'emploie, avec l'aide d'une douzaine de conseillers au Parlement et de deux cents marguilliers des principales paroisses, à faire disparaître les nudités exposées dans les lieux publics, tels que places, boulevards, rues, ruelles, quais, impasses et jardins. Et non content d'établir la modestie sur la voie publique, je m'efforce de la faire régner jusque dans les salons, cabinets

et chambres à coucher, d'où elle est trop souvent bannie. Sachez, monsieur, que la société que j'ai fondée fait faire des trousseaux pour les jeunes mariés, où il se trouve des chemises amples et longues, avec un petit pertuis qui permet aux jeunes époux de procéder chastement à l'exécution du commandement de Dieu relatif à la croissance et à la multiplication. Et, pour mêler, si j'ose le dire, les grâces à l'austérité, ces ouvertures sont entourées de broderies agréables. Je me flatte d'avoir imaginé de la sorte de vêtements intimes extrêmement propres à faire de tous les nouveaux couples une autre Sarah et un autre Tobie, et à nettoyer le sacrement du mariage des impuretés qui y sont malheureusement attachées."

Another type of prudery is caused by the disgust of sexless persons in regard to pleasures which they do not understand, and in the more remote past this disgust has been mingled with a very real fear of divine wrath. It may be that in these days a bad harvest is not regarded as the result of unusual laxity in matters of sex ; but I remember a relic of the sentiment in a post-prandial remark made by the Commander-in-Chief of a famous garrison. Some junior officers were discussing the possibility of re-

ducing the amount of venereal disease among the troops, on which the old gentleman reminded us that syphilis was the "finger of God." I remember that I was never again invited to the Mess because I could not help enquiring what the rest of God was like if one of his fingers was syphilis.

Asceticism is perhaps more usually the result of fear than of physical incapacity ; and the nature of that fear is to-day being explored by various psycho-analysts. Examples of a real complex may easily be found in the extravagances of the man-hating woman who was produced by the agitation for the suffrage ; and, as we know, the monks of Mount Athos will not allow any female animal or bird in the monastery, and will not even eat a female fish. This kind of prudery is often allied with the jealousy felt for the young by the old. It is of course most necessary to protect very young people from being perverted by the old ; but a certain amount of modern legislation betrays a tendency on the part of the old, who have a considerable monopoly over legislation, to interfere with the sexual relationships of the young.

One may perhaps trace in other legislation a military tendency to the regimentation of all sexual intercourse. There is a certain type of person who wants to make everyone do the same

thing in the same manner and at the same moment. Perhaps the best known instance of this was the issue of military orders to the German Army just before mobilisation in 1914 to impregnate all females so as to ensure an adequate supply of German soldiers for the year 1934.

The fierce passions involved in the creation of prudery would readily account for prudes being and becoming the enemies of liberty, especially when, as in these days, the prude is more and more driven to the policeman instead of to the priest or minister. I do not of course suggest that the State can remain purely passive in regard to sex problems, for the State must obviously preserve the community from such breaches of the peace as would ensue on the State leaving the individual citizen to keep order where offences against public modesty are concerned. Some standard of decency must obviously be preserved, and it will fluctuate from time to time. Thus, before 1900 a magistrate thought it necessary to fine any woman who smoked cigarettes in public, and this restraint was also imposed before 1914 on women who walked about in male costume. To-day, however, women are very free in these respects, and the attention of the modern police is more concentrated on the question

of mixed bathing and the clothes that should be worn on such occasions.

The bather is more and more persecuted as the country becomes more crowded. I can remember that when I was a boy at Eton it was quite unnecessary up to the year 1894 to wear any clothes when bathing in the Thames, and there was no question of indecency until boat-loads of women with opera-glasses were moored against the bank opposite the bathing place known as "Athens." A loud outcry was then raised, and the Thames Conservancy has since ordained that all male bathers are to wear what is known as University costume, being a dress which covers the entire trunk. One may suppose that in the near future the police will inspect the reaches of the Thames in aeroplanes to make sure of these regulations being properly observed. The prude, however, is not yet content, as I have recently read a long correspondence about the gross indecency of the University costume. It appears that men are to be compelled to wear skirts and that these skirts must be firmly attached to the knee. I can only conclude that in the course of the next twenty years men will be compelled to wear shoes and stockings in the water as American ladies have to do now, under pain of being fined by a police magistrate. I need scarcely

say that the police are not as a rule much interested in these matters but are goaded into action by old women armed with large telescopes.

Conversation with the youth of our time might encourage anyone to believe that prudery was dead; but the melancholy fact remains that the spread of democracy entails progressive interference. Thus *espionage* on open spaces seems to become more and more frequent, and if the police are tepid on this question there is plenty of voluntary effort available. The police find it difficult to discourage voluntary effort without appearing to encourage what is commonly called "immorality," and it is obviously better for the police to maintain any order that is to be maintained rather than to leave the crusaders free to do as they like. For crusading activities only lead to breaches of the peace.

There are, however, many other points which appear to agitate the modern prude. One of these is the question of raising the female age of consent. Quite a number of persons seem inclined to raise this age to 21, and it seems quite possible that in our time the age may be raised to 30 and that some kind of legal fiction will have to be invented in respect of young women who marry and have children under this age. I do not even now understand the

legal position of a man who marries a girl of 15 and becomes a father.

One of the most edifying exhibitions of modern prudery was the passing in the House of Commons, by 148 votes to 53, of a clause penalising homosexuality between women. On that occasion 150 members were whipped up to get this bill through, although some 500 members were either unable to be present, or unaware of the proceedings, or too indifferent to attend. I cannot improve on the comments made by various peers, including the Lord Chancellor, on this bill; and even the Archbishop of Canterbury found it "practically impossible to give any cordial support to it."

In regard to all activities of the police in these matters we find an enormous increase of *agents provocateurs*, both male and female; and even the King's Proctor has taken to crossing the Channel and enjoying excursions in the Riviera at the public expense. Mr Ives¹ quotes the remark of a female J.P. who in 1921 is reported to have advocated the flogging of any man found with a prostitute. As Mr Ives remarks, "This sort of thing may go on until the youth of the country all become

¹ *The Continued Extension of the Criminal Law*, p. 29. By George Ives, M.A. London, 1922.

criminals and until the law becomes a hated oppression."

There is of course a growing enlightenment in regard to questions of venereal disease and birth control. Even though our statesmen considered it necessary to imitate German institutions during the second decade of this century and threw all regard for liberty to the winds, yet the stern facts of the war compelled the general public to an attitude of comparative sanity in regard to fighting venereal disease and tolerating information about birth control. But we must not rely too much on the War in matters of this kind, for in France the agitation against birth control was carried so far that the British representative of the Malthusian League in Paris was forbidden by the French Government to give any information at his disposal to German prisoners. This is an ultimate *reductio ad absurdum*. The only way in which France could obtain any indemnity from Germany would be to restrain the increase of the German population so that the French could obtain the surplus profits of German labour, and if it seemed expedient, increase her own population. But to interfere with information of this kind being imparted to the Germans seems to show an incredible want of logic in French politicians.

One must not of course assume that the activities of the prude are as harmless as they are ridiculous. Obviously, the mere publication of a sexual accusation, even if, as in the FitzRoy case, it is merely an offence against the police etiquette of Hyde Park, exposes the victim to social and in some cases economic ruin. No politician or professional man can afford to have his name published in the newspapers in such a connexion, and poor men and women often lose their jobs and have to change their names. Public opinion certainly shows a strong reaction against all this kind of persecution, for Mr Ives quotes Sir George Cave and Mr Cecil Chapman as stating that "juries already acquit about fifty per cent. of prisoners accused of sexual offences."¹ This is just what happened in regard to capital punishment in the early part of the nineteenth century, when men, women, and even children, were hanged for certain forms of petty larceny. This tendency is reinforced by the influence of female jurors, who, supported by the more enlightened judges of the Bench, now assert their right to sit on juries in spite of all insolent comments by counsel. One can easily understand feminine influence being exerted in this way, having regard to the strong resentment

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

that women feel against the law on solicitation and the blackmail of prostitutes by the police. As Mr Ives remarks ¹ :

“The whole Law on solicitation is highly dangerous especially to youthful and humble people of either sex.

“So little indeed seems needed to constitute an offence, that an alleged smile or wink, or look, may cause an arrest. In fact, so little satisfies some magistrates in these cases, that a defence is extremely difficult, and, in practice, the liberty of any young person is at the mercy of any two detectives hunting in couples. And the police are given a degree of unchecked authority which places the liberty of citizens entirely in their hands ; and as there are a certain number of scoundrels in any large body of men, it would be more than optimistic to say that such unbounded power is not abused.”

It is to be hoped that in these circumstances the modern State will eschew American Puritanism and will not interfere with any sexual indiscretions except the perversion of youth and the violation of public modesty. Such a policy would economise the expenditure

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

on our police and leave what policemen we have more time to detect really serious crime, such as robbery with violence and murder. This policy would have the merit of expressing the real sentiment of the community and would to that extent ensure respect for the law.

Any activity of the State in excess of what is really necessary ministers to nothing better than the pleasure which old, prurient-minded, and inquisitorial persons derive from intruding into the private concerns of other citizens in order to indulge the desire for exhaustive discussion of sexual offences under the hypocritical pretence of public duty.

CHAPTER VIII

THE WAR-LORD

THE difficulty of establishing liberty in the past is the same as that of securing it in the present, namely, the congealing of all societies from time to time by the necessities of war. We are accustomed to regard patriarchal society as a society frozen by custom ; yet within the limits of custom there must have been considerable scope for liberty in time of peace and a certain choice of vocation, and it must also be remembered that what appears servitude to one man is really perfect freedom to another. The routine of self-imposed duties does not gall those who perform them. Real servitude involves such compulsion as that of a man who is by vocation a priest to be a soldier or of a woman who is by temperament a mother to be a vestal virgin. Such compulsion is apt to occur only when society is, as I have said, congealed by a fear of destruction.

Patriarchal society in the case of Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, and Rome gradually developed

into what Mr Belfort Bax calls "more or less loose confederacies of cities under an overlordship, whose powers were mainly exercised in the direction of military service and of fiscal subsidies usually for war purposes." The coercive machinery of these empires was therefore quiescent except in time of war, and the local centres and cities enjoyed considerable autonomy. The same conditions are true of mediæval Europe, with its free cities, its territorial jurisdictions, and cosmopolitan Church and clergy. But in Western Europe, India, and Japan there occurred what is called the Feudal System, which, as Mr Jenks has suggested, represents a compromise between purely patriarchal and purely political society.¹ The feudal tie of allegiance bound the vassal to render military service to the lord as a condition of land tenure, and logically involved the toleration of private war. Private war, however, was not tolerated by the Norman kings of England, who made all land-owning men take direct oaths of fealty to the sovereign himself. This centralisation of government made private war always difficult, and after the Wars of the Roses almost impossible, and this immunity from private war, combined with insular security, has done much to preserve

¹ *The State and the Nation.* By Edward Jenks. 1919.

all the elements of the British character which make for the liberty of voluntary co-operation as opposed to the servitude of compulsory coercion.

The policy of the Norman kings was widely imitated on the continent of Europe at a much later stage, and in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries we see the European nation-state becoming the unit of power. The increasing complexity of any community in time of war involves a process of centralisation which necessarily destroys or transforms the existing liberty of many individuals and groups; but this centralising process derives its energy from an instinct of self-preservation and can never permanently prevail in time of peace unless the changes which it has brought about ultimately express the general will of the community. For in time of peace the centralisation thus achieved thaws back into the natural flow of free human intercourse and intercommunication, as we see in the disintegration of Europe just as the Roman Empire was declining and before it had been seriously broken up by barbarian invasions. Such a period may be, and often is, one of great happiness for individuals and family groups, and the centralising process only revives because men seem unable to live in peace with each other for any long period of time, if only because every population has a

tendency to expand beyond means of subsistence and then to attack the territory and wealth of its more peaceable and less prolific neighbours.

For the reasons above stated, however, the growth of liberty in Great Britain has been much less precarious owing to the establishment of a central authority under the Norman kings and to a sense of insular security. As an island Great Britain attracted adventurers of all kinds, but more particularly adventurers who were not afraid of the sea and had all that individuality of character which we associate with those who go down to the sea in ships, whether for war or for commerce. Therefore, in "this happy breed of men, this little world, this precious stone set in the silver sea," there grew up a tradition of personal freedom which gradually expanded from the baron to the burgess, and in the early decades of the nineteenth century even to the humblest citizen. This tradition was not only the impulse of the great volunteer Army and Navy which sprang up to defend the shores of these islands in 1914, but also of the host of men who came to help them from all ends of the earth.

The tradition of personal freedom, based upon external peace and security, has given the inhabitants of the British Empire a permanent bias against unnecessary war. One

may search the records of the British Empire and the United States of America from 1800 onwards, and, with the possible exception of the Crimean War, find a stainless record in regard to human bloodshed.¹ The resources of the English-speaking world have been reserved for the maintenance of a world-wide order.

I do not say that Great Britain has always had absolutely clean hands. There was a war with China in the middle of the nineteenth century, and also a war with the Boers at the end of that century, in which the scutcheon may have been a little tarnished; but I can at least maintain that if there was any suspicion of taint it was denounced quite as freely in the House of Commons as by any foreign critic; and that is more than anyone can say of the war Germany chose to inaugurate in 1914 and of German politicians. I shall have something to say in this chapter about the connexion of war-lords and financiers; but up to the present they may perhaps be classified into four different types. There is in the first place, the kind of dynastic war-lord whose tradition was inaugurated by Napoleon the First and degrading to the tradition of Napoleon the Third and the ex-Kaiser Wilhelm. It is by now generally

¹ The war of 1912 scarcely counts and the civil war in the U.S.A. was at least fought on a vital issue.

admitted that just as war creates the dynast, so the dynast cannot last without intermittent if not incessant war. The dynast can only fight the jealousy that surrounds his throne with the threat of external aggression, and it was this calculation on the part of Bismarck which made him see that the King of Prussia in 1870 could force Napoleon the Third into what was, on the face of it, an unjust war. It was reserved for the present ex-Kaiser to expel Bismarck from his office with ignominy and to involve the whole world in bloodshed without one single redeeming excuse.

In the second place, we find war-lords like Hindenburg and Tirpitz, whose one occupation in life is war. I have a hankering sympathy with men of this type ; for it must be exasperating to learn a trade which one is never allowed to test by experience. I do not imagine that any solicitor would be very happy if he were never allowed to issue a real writ or to have the experience of real litigation. Nevertheless, it is obvious that men of this type must exist until the whole world admits the sanctity of a League of Nations, and it is difficult to know how they should be treated in time of peace. I remember meeting shortly after the War a German lawyer who maintained with reason that no commanding officer of a

German submarine should be responsible for carrying out his orders. But this lawyer was not at all pleased when I remarked that if I were a judge at an international court I should immediately sentence Tirpitz to be shot. In fact he so far perverted my remarks as to publish a statement in a German paper that an English colleague had entirely agreed with him about the whole question of war crimes at sea, although the language that I had used to him about these crimes was for the most part unprintable.

The third type of war-lord is what I may call the Nationalist politician in modern Europe. There is a certain type of politician in France and Germany whose speeches suggest the stink of sour wine in a *cabaret* on the morning after an orgy, and these unpleasant persons exist like parasites on the fermentation of national hatred. To the British mind it is as if Mr Lloyd George had lived on the promotion of war between Wales and England and had raised enormous sums of money to fortify the Anglo-Welsh frontier. In writing this I am thinking more of the internecine quarrels between France and Italy, and Serbia and Bulgaria, than of the Franco-German antagonism. So far as France is concerned I quite realise that the traditions and the population of France are homogeneous, as they are not in

the case of any other European country. If I were a benevolent despot I should kill the German Empire once and for all and re-establish the confederation of the Rhenish States which Napoleon Buonaparte set up. But whatever prejudices Englishmen may have, it must be clear that the Kilkenny-cat policy of France and Germany has become an intolerable anachronism, and if it continues much longer the rest of the world will intervene to end it, just as one would end a duel of machine-gunners in Trafalgar Square for the sake of the general peace and convenience of the civilised world. If the world is to choose between the predominance of France or Germany in Europe it will probably side with France; but only on condition that the French people will abandon all the militarist rhodomontade of the two Napoleons and of the last few years. France would in all probability have been quite reasonable but for the refusal of the United States to ratify President Wilson's guarantee of security against German invasion.

This guarantee might have created for France the same atmosphere of security that has resulted in the Canadian frontier being left unfortified for no less than one hundred years; but in the absence of it Europe is at the mercy of the Nationalist politician and of the private

armament maker. Since the War the armament maker has been trying to turn his machine guns into sewing machines; but the process seems to have resulted in a lamentable reduction of dividends. The British Empire deserves honour as having broken all records in the matter of international arbitration during the nineteenth century. France also deserves honour as coming next in the record; but France will never enter into competition with us again unless she is given security.

The security demanded by France in 1919 was either a guarantee of protection against Germany from the British Empire and the United States of America, or the bridge-heads of the Rhine; for under present conditions no German army can deploy if France holds these bridge-heads. So far the English-speaking world has withheld any guarantee of security, and will not assist France to obtain the bridge-heads.

This is partly because the English and Americans believe in the possibility of universal peace, whereas France, like all other Continental powers, believes that peace cannot be accomplished for more than fifty years at a time, and this only if the victor in any war obtains the spoils of victory. It is lamentable that the British and American Governments with all their enthusiasm for peace and general

well-being cannot or will not understand the French point of view, for unless or until they do France will continue in arms and nationalism will continue to disturb and impoverish the continent of Europe.

If, however, France ultimately obtains some satisfactory solution of the problems which she has to face the whole world must take such measures as are necessary to minimise the causes of war. There must be a total abolition of private armament makers, of swash-bucklers like the inhabitants of the Balkans, and of national vendettas. These persons and things must be wiped out with the same energy as we expend on the destruction of mosquitoes and other agents of disease. For unless Europe recovers its old mediæval unity it will be at the mercy of the Turk and of the yellow races. Few Europeans realise the terrible danger of Europe in connexion with the Near East. The Turks and the Mohammedan world generally have watched with great curiosity the spectacle of Christian nations slaughtering each other with all the resources of modern science for more than four years and then continuing the feud by every means except that of naked force. If Europe cannot compose its quarrels it is doomed to Oriental domination in one way or another. We shall have the Turk back in

Vienna, supported by Bolshevik armies, unless the East is made to realise that Europe has some capacity for self-defence.

It is impossible to rely on the League of Nations at a time when no one ventures to suggest that France should abstain from invading the Ruhr without the sanction of the League. If the European brawl continues indefinitely there is no resource left but the establishment of a financial Anglo-American alliance, in which if necessary China and Japan must be included. Heroic measures will be necessary if the homicidal maniacs of Europe cannot recover their senses.

The redemption of the world from its present misery depends more on Russia than on any other country. If the Russian people can shake off the Bolshevik régime they may yet become the surest allies of peace and of economic reconstruction. The history of Prussia makes it difficult for anyone to believe that the Prussian let loose can ever cease to be the enemy of the human race ; but there is no reason to believe that he will not acquiesce in servitude if the rest of Europe recovers any sanity. The most real and perhaps the most obvious danger to civilisation at this moment is the possibility of an alliance between Prussia, Bolshevik Russia, and military Japan, for the oppression of the

human race and for the destruction of liberty and civilisation. The danger is great because the military leaders in each case share a common hatred of liberty, and for different reasons there is in Prussia, in Russia, and in Japan a curious instinct for the sort of communism which is based on military servitude. The only hope for liberty is that the Russian peasant will achieve victory in the war which he has so successfully inaugurated in the cause of private property against Lenin and Trotsky. If liberty is once achieved in Russia the Russian people will be a wedge firmly set up between Prussia and Japan. There are to-day many publicists who insist that Prussia is dead ; but Prussia is not dead ; it is only for the moment discredited. For three hundred years Europe has learnt at repeated intervals that for Prussia the magic of robbery turns sand into gold, and nothing but robbery could achieve that transmutation of Prussian soil. As has often been said, war is the national industry of Prussia, and the soil of Prussia is the last place where war will be abolished.

If, however, war in the ordinary sense is abolished, we shall still have to deal with the financier and the super-capitalist. We may get rid of Hindenburg but we have still got to deal with Stinnes. Political corruption is

possibly more humane than war ; but no one can wish it to prevail universally. No doubt many human lives were saved by the purchase from Russian revolutionaries by the Japanese Government of the information which enabled Japan to blow up the Russian Fleet in Port Arthur and thus to prevent the transport of any more Russian troops to Japan. No doubt millions of lives could have been saved if the British Government had had the intelligence to spend two millions in August 1914 on the right politicians in Turkey. No doubt, also, the human race may survive in the future merely because an international alliance of financiers may be able to compose their differences without wholesale massacre. But it is not pleasant to imagine this process carried too far. If, for example, an Anglo-American company secretly obtained the sanction of the British and American Governments to the sale of the West Indies to the United States, it would obviously be useless for the West Indians to offer any kind of armed resistance. Yet anyone must flinch from a vision of the world in which such a transaction would be possible. That is why, even if the war-lord is eliminated from international politics, the financier will always remain a formidable enemy of liberty so long as he can exert political power in secret.

CHAPTER IX

THE SUPER-CAPITALIST

DURING the last thirty years we have all read much crude denunciation of capitalism. The authors of this denunciation usually lack any knowledge of political economy and do not seem to realise that when they denounce capitalism they include the modest purchaser of War Certificates and the subscriber to the Post Office Savings Bank.¹ The person whom they really intend to attack is the super-capitalist, and by the super-capitalist I mean the type of man who, having no interest in life besides money-making, proceeds to use his savings in the capricious exercise of power over his unfortunate fellow-creatures.

It is interesting to note that the super-capitalist, whether English or American, is usually of much the same type. If one were

¹ "Lenin tried to run a State without capital and found it impossible. If we destroy capital then we sink back to a state of simple agriculture, in which each man consumes his own fruits and leaves those whose land is not fruitful or whose labour is weakened by age to starve."—Mr Raymond Radcliffe (*New Witness*, 16th March 1923).

to obtain a composite photograph in a psychological sense of Rockefeller, Gould, Hearst, Leverhulme, Beaverbrook, and Ashfield, the photograph would not be very different from any one individual. The type displayed is that of an average sensual man with a thousand horsepower. He is usually either a professed Nonconformist or an atheist with Nonconformist prejudices but unpleasantly unctuous and inclined to a queer kind of devil-worship which seems an inevitable consequence of dealing with huge sums of money, just as men become superstitious on the battlefield.

One may easily classify these persons into three different types: (1) the master of industry; (2) the transport magnate; and (3) the big newspaper proprietor.

(1) I need not waste much time describing the industrial magnate. His existence is principally known to the public by the syrens which sound at 8 A.M., at noon, and at 5 P.M. throughout most big cities. A vast number of human beings become for all practical purposes his slaves, subject only to trade union rules which impose an equally humiliating slavery on the worker. These unfortunate beings live in an atmosphere of deadening routine and are the victims of a process commonly called social welfare. It is perhaps not necessary to set out

in detail all that social welfare means ; but it has all the odour of modern Puritanism. Mr G. K. Chesterton describes the Puritan master of industry as feeling a responsibility for the slave without any respect for man. He elaborates an interesting distinction between the Pagan world and the Puritan world which is well worth attention, though it is perhaps a little full-bodied :—

“ In one sense the white slave may have a great deal of liberty, for those who interpret it merely as laxity. The white slaves of the old pagan world often attained to all that a free lover would call freedom. And the master of the new Servile State will say to the servile proletarian of the future exactly what the lord of the pagan slave-state said to the pagan slave, or the lord of the negro slave-state to the negro slave : ‘ So far as sex is concerned, you can pretty well let yourself go as often as you have the chance. You have no family heritage. You have no family name. You have no property ; you have no reputation. It does not matter whether your children are legitimate or illegitimate, for there is nothing that they can legitimately inherit. It does not matter whether your family remains respectable, for nobody will be called upon to respect it. For

130 THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

me you are simply something that is meant to work, and it does not matter to me how or when you manage to play. Lucky brute, run away and play ; and thank your brute gods that you have no vows ; that you have no honour ; that you have no name.'

" That was the pagan attitude, and that is the common human attitude towards slaves. And that is the attitude of the modern press to the modern proletariat, in so far as they are merely pagan. But there is this difference ; that in countries where the Christian tradition has been, there is also something that is not pagan but rather Puritan. For Puritanism is a disease of Christianity just as Capitalism is a disease of property. Therefore, the modern world suffers more than the ancient world from fads that have the intensity of faiths. At least it has so suffered ever since the Reformation ; that is, ever since the sort of enthusiast who was once content to found a religious order felt it necessary to found a religion. The Puritan vinegar was the second fermentation of the Christian wine. Whenever this acid fermentation has taken place, there is another element complicating the natural connection between slavery and free love. The Puritan feels a responsibility for the slave without feeling a respect for the man ; he cannot forget the

morality of the thing even when he means to make it more immoral. And as the corruption of the best is the worst, the Puritan tyranny is worse than the pagan tyranny. It cannot rise to the carelessness of paganism. It is not content with making the labours of the servant useful to the master. It wishes to make the very pleasures of the servant also useful to the master. From this arises all the capitalist philanthropy which enforces athletics or over-sees amusements. It is stating a very grim and ironic truth in saying that it encourages exercise. Here all entertainment is exercise and only exercise ; for it is the preparation for something else. Play is only exercise for work. And work is not work for the profit of the worker ; but of the owner. The worker enjoys even sport for the sake of something else, for the benefit of somebody else. From this also, of course, comes every kind of discipline regarding the diet of the slaves ; teetotalism to-day and possibly vegetarianism to-morrow. From this finally comes the insane insolence of Eugenics. It seeks to use the pleasure of sex just as it uses the pleasure of sport.”¹

(2) The railway magnate controls the existence of the unfortunate middle classes more

¹ *The New Witness*, 3rd November 1922.

intimately than the master of industry. All over the country we suffer from the rotten finance and inefficient working of railways; but perhaps the Londoner suffers more than anyone else at the hands of a super-capitalist like Lord Ashfield, who spent his early life in the United States and there acquired his instinct for inflating statistics if not dividends at the cost of human comfort if not safety. Anyone who for his sins is compelled to travel on a London Tube will realise at once what I mean. The contempt of the officials for the ordinary human passenger results in a system under which human beings are treated rather worse than cattle being driven to market. The cattle, however, are not able to read, and are therefore spared the chronic irritation which the human passenger suffers from reading the idiotic posters which are scattered all over the stations and staircases in regard to the number of trains run in a day and various other statistics which are supposed to make the passenger feel pleased and proud that he is allowed the privilege of enduring the insolent tyranny of the officials who thrive upon the generosity of Lord Ashfield and his friends. These railway magnates are rich enough to employ a vast horde of secret police who from time to time accuse certain passengers of mal-

practices which are only rendered possible by the overcrowding which prevails on the railway. To my mind it seems more desirable to increase the number of trains or the number of cars on each train so as to avoid overcrowding than to employ an army of detectives who are not even amenable to the jurisdiction of Scotland Yard ; but by this time I have been forced to the conclusion that I am a hopeless eccentric.

(3) The newspaper proprietor is perhaps a greater menace to liberty than either the master of industry or the transport magnate, because he really does rule public opinion more comprehensively than any other super-capitalist. His ignorant prejudices naturally result in his employing ignorant editors. It is due to the newspaper proprietor to say that on the whole he gives his editor a free hand ; but for that very reason he chooses an editor who is not very likely to disagree with the views of his employer. I need not perhaps enlarge on a topic which has been fully discussed by Mr Belloe in his book about the Press ; nor will I enumerate all the points on which it is clear to me that the ordinary newspaper suppresses what is true and suggests what is false. I have noticed, however, that in questions which affect the super-capitalist and Church or Chapel the newspaper reader is not as a rule

allowed to know the facts which ought to be brought to his notice. In discussing such questions as the intervention of the King's Proctor, or the immortality of the soul, or police tyranny, the ordinary editor tends to suppress discussion and to indulge in various reflections about materialism and the alleged vices of the later Roman Empire, which may be due to his own ignorance of the subject-matter but which are more probably due to an expert knowledge of the limits within which he is allowed to discuss problems which might worry his readers if they were told some thing which they had never heard before.

There is, however, a general conspiracy of all super-capitalists against individual liberty. It may often be true that a super-capitalist finds himself in a money-making groove from which it would be very difficult for him to retire without frustrating not merely ambition but also the whole scheme of his life. His mind is usually so concentrated on making money that it would be very difficult for him to leave off doing so. On the other hand, making money on a big scale is usually associated with a lust for power over other men and women, and this they indulge to the full ; as we can all see in the case of Lord Leverhulme. What the super-capitalist needs to understand is

that he is tolerated principally because he is regarded as the last bulwark of private enterprise against bureaucracy, and if he were really shrewd he would encourage the peasant and the small investor instead of reducing everyone to the level of the Servile State. At present, however, the activities of the super-capitalist are the main support of the Collectivist. The Collectivist argues with more plausibility than accuracy that the bureaucrat is at least responsible to the State, but that the super-capitalist is not.

It is the stock-in-trade of the Fabian to insist upon the brutal stupidity of dowagers and dukes in relation to social needs ; but like most Fabian propaganda this is quite out of date. The aristocracy have not been allowed to exploit the lower orders to any serious extent since 1850. The aristocracy had their day and abused their powers up to 1850. They enclosed a considerable amount of common land and they made tyrannical game laws. In the nineteenth century the tyranny of the super-capitalist was quickly established. His treatment of women and children led to the enactment of the Factory Acts, and the rise of the railway magnates caused the destruction of our canals and led to their being granted the most extravagant monopolies, which have been

consistently abused. If all railway monopolies were destroyed to-morrow the trade and agriculture of Great Britain might be established on a really secure foundation.

The time has now come when we find every super-capitalist openly or secretly obtaining the assistance of the State to destroy the liberties of the individual, to exploit his patriotism in war and his ignorance and amiability in peace. The most typical example of this process is the sale of honours to the super-capitalist. Few sensible persons object to the sale of honours, and most of us would agree to Father Knox's suggestion that we should pay our debt to the United States by selling a certain number of dukedoms, marquisates, baronetcies, and knighthoods. But what is clearly objectionable is the sale by any given ministry of policies; the sale, for instance, to a cocoa super-capitalist of State support for local option, or the sale to a master of industry of facilities for sterilising persons supposed to be mental defectives, or the sale to a railway magnate of a monopoly which would abolish the carriage of goods on motor vehicles. It is perhaps not surprising that in all the Parliamentary and newspaper discussion which has taken place in regard to the sale of honours, not one word has been permitted in regard to

the vital necessity of auditing Party funds, even when the sudden experience of a European war has made it quite clear that foreign contributions to British Party funds may be far more deadly than the concerted operations of foreign spies.

I may perhaps be excused for repeating what I wrote on this subject seven years ago. My remarks at that time met with very hostile criticism in the Press and elsewhere ; but that is no reason why I should not reiterate them as the book of which they formed a part has not been republished.

“ I think that the above considerations fully explain the dangers to individual liberty that I have described in the preceding chapters. We are faced with the growth of the Servile State and of the most puerile restrictions on the personal freedom in some cases of the rich, but always of the poor, which would never come into being if the majority of voters in this country had any real or practical connexion with the government of this country. On the contrary, these results are due to the tyranny of plutocrats who buy legislative and administrative facilities from the Government of the day. Plutocrats of this description find it a cheap and wise policy to enslave the poor by

doles, like a man who will not admit his son's right to an allowance but prefers to pay his bills and give him occasional tips so as to obtain constant control through the purse-strings. They are often cranks and fanatics like the United Kingdom Alliance, or the sort of Puritan who indulges his suppressed sexual desires by interfering with the normal indulgence of them by his fellow-creatures. The decline of liberty is therefore not surprising under these conditions ; especially when we remember that the whole system is secret and that it would be very easy to stop the exposure of it if opinions like mine were at all widely accepted. The really surprising feature of our time is that any remnant of liberty should remain alive in this country. We have no individual liberty except in regard to political discussion, and even this liberty is a fraud because it gives us no participation in the government of the country."

CHAPTER X

THE POLITICIAN

I SUPPOSE that politicians exist in the House of Lords as well as in the House of Commons; but this chapter principally concerns members of the House of Commons and their satellites, as well as members of municipal bodies. In the House of Commons the righteous men who have a sense of liberty can be counted on the fingers of one hand, and at this moment I can only remember two by name, namely, Sir Frederick Banbury and Colonel Aubrey Herbert. I write in no spirit of hostility to the present Ministry.¹ Lord Younger certainly made a serious effort to clean out the Augaeon stable of Lloyd-Georgian politics. Anyone could invite a Cabinet Minister to a meal to-day without worrying about eavesdroppers, and the present Cabinet are undoubtedly respectable enough to understand what is meant by liberty and to do what they can for that sacred cause. Unfortunately they appear to be handicapped by

¹ That of March 1923.

their own principles, and have not gained all the popularity that I could wish them to enjoy.

Their failure, if I am right in calling it a failure, is due to the fact that the assumptions of the Servile State contribute the whole atmosphere of fashionable politics. The Servile State is not merely convenient to the master of industry and his friends but also contributes to the politician's sense of importance. A politician obviously strikes the public imagination better by imposing penalties than by abolishing restrictions ; and although I think it quite right that women should be elected members of the House of Commons if their constituents desire it, I cannot help remarking that the only two women now in the House of Commons seem to spend their time in introducing the despotism of the nursery into the political institutions of Great Britain. Lady Astor has plainly avowed her intentions in this respect, and has said that she wishes to enslave men in proportion to her affection for them. But I do not suppose that most advocates of female suffrage contemplated the atmosphere of the nursery finding its way into the House of Commons.

I need not again lay stress on the anxiety of plutocratic and other faddists who wish to

coerce the mob into drinking cocoa, or living in octagonal houses, or wearing digitated socks, or believing in Christian Science ; nor perhaps in these days need I refer to the obvious inclination of politicians now out of office to create innumerable jobs of inspection and interference for their private friends.

Meanwhile it may not be superfluous to mention that men like John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, Auberon Herbert, and Walter Morrison are all extinct, not only because they are dead but because they have left no successors to carry on their work. Auberon Herbert and Walter Morrison were rich men and spared no effort or propaganda to fight the continuous oppression of the ordinary man by administrative machinery. The only active propagandists of our day are wealthy writers like Mr Bernard Shaw and Mr and Mrs Sidney Webb. The Webbs, having been foiled in their attempt to set up the complete Servile State, are now content to describe poverty as slavery ; but they seem singularly disinclined to encourage the small investor or any kind of individual effort. The poor person can never escape the paternal, or perhaps I should say the maternal, control of the State, and cannot be saved unless he can be included in the general scheme of Collectivist machinery.

The Webbs assert quite truly that poverty diminishes individual liberty, in the sense that it makes certain amenities of life impossible; but the only sane way of diminishing poverty is to increase property, and the effort of the poor man to become rich does not appear congenial to the Webb scheme of the universe. They do not so much want to see the poor become richer as the rich become poorer, and as the rich become poorer they are to become subordinated to the Webb bureaucracy. The tax-payer is never to be allowed to shake off his present burdens but he is to find consolation in contemplating the rapid increase of a bureaucracy who are to tell everyone, both rich and poor, how best to spend their days and nights.

The politician is therefore surrounded on every side by influences hostile to liberty. The newspapers obtain an increasing influence on public opinion, although probably fifty per cent. of newspaper readers are now fairly well informed about the motives of "newspaper proprietors and their employees. Every modern newspaper is full of "stunts" which involve interference with A, B, and C. Even when the proprietor of any given newspaper has no particular motive to initiate a new "stunt" of this kind, we may be quite certain

that any proposal for interference is sure to be popular with the average newspaper reader. Newspaper readers consist largely of poor and unimportant persons who suffer so much bullying and tyranny in their own lives that they like to feel that other people are being treated in the same way. They derive an illusion of power and of superior virtue when they read of other persons being arrested and convicted and virulently abused first by the judge who tries the case and secondly by some absurd little leader-writer on a newspaper. Election agents tell me that nothing appeals to the spinster voter so forcibly as conscription of the men who have remained indifferent to her charms and there is no doubt that the lives of many married women would be blighted if divorce cases were not fully reported.

I remember the wife of a very eminent judge showing me a scrap-book in which she kept various notes which had been passed from hand to hand during famous trials, and when I suggested that the publication of these trials grossly violated the privacy of domestic life she merely said that nobody ought to do anything which could "shock the sentiments of the people of England." It never appeared to dawn on her during her lifetime, any more

than it dawns on the intelligence of my contemporaries, that persons who are forced into the law courts by appalling injustice should be treated with proper consideration and protected from the obscene curiosity of the disgusting people who invade the law courts and batten on the *News of the World* and other kindred publications on Sunday afternoons.

The conditions of modern democracy create a state of opinion in which people at large support new penal measures every day without reflecting for a moment on the advantages of any alternative method which implies any reliance on the innate good qualities of human beings when trusted to do their best for the community and themselves. I sometimes wonder if the very artificial peace of what we call civilisation does not imply a suppressed violence which finds relief in the coercion of others. As Earl Russell once wrote :

“ In the relations between a community and its members there must necessarily be restrictions upon individual liberty, and the more complex the organisation of the community the more numerous and detailed must be the restrictions. The growth of these restrictions is not incompatible with an increasing amount of liberty in those matters which make the real

individual life. As both a socialist and a strong individualist I realise to the full the pressure of both these considerations. As an instance of the former we may take the growing, detailed, and sometimes irksome requirements of the Public Health Acts : as an instance of the latter the growth of individual liberty in matters of religion. The object of political action in a free State should be to restrain as little as possible the freedom of the individual to live his own life, think his own thoughts, and spend his own energies in the way that seems most desirable to him, except in those cases where the public safety or welfare imperatively demands interference with this freedom. This principle is often lost sight of nowadays, and those who are in power frequently seem to welcome coercion for its own sake because it saves them the trouble of thought. Thought is slow, painful, and laborious ; coercion is easy, and appears to superficial observers to give the results desired. But the spirit which argues in this way is a spirit of brute force, of violence, and of unreason : it is not the spirit of a free people going rejoicingly and proudly on its way. The nation coerced, dragooned, and regimented is a nation infected with the Prussian spirit : it is no longer that free England of whose traditions we are proud."

' The vice of all democracy, and especially of modern democracy, is that it has inherited the traditions of the rich interfering with the poor. The democrat cannot understand that interference with the poor is not cured by interference with every individual. The only way of improving the character and opportunities of the poor is to educate them in the aristocratic tradition and to give them a sense of dignity and responsibility.

I have dwelt upon the climate of popular opinion because the politician has nothing else to live in, and it is perhaps unfair to ask him to swim against the stream. He is expected to become what is called a leader, which means that he is supposed to ascertain what the people really want. I cannot help feeling that the politician is not sufficiently sensitive to the real flow of the stream underneath the foam and eddies of the surface. I do not for one moment believe that the majority of English men and women seriously wish to be dragooned as the German has been dragooned by the Prussian and as the American has been dragooned by the Irishman. I am sure that men like the present Prime Minister and his colleagues have formed a perfectly just estimate of public opinion and that they ought in the end to gain the confidence of the electorate

in eschewing sensational legislation and in endeavouring to promote individual liberty. Their task, however, is made very difficult by their predecessors, because the people to-day have inherited a tradition of rash and promiscuous coercion, and they have not altogether outgrown the simple faith that Parliament can do all sorts of things which are quite impossible for any Parliament to perform. Nevertheless, even the virtuous politician will remain the enemy of liberty unless and until he succeeds in having the courage of his opinions and in educating public opinion to appreciate what is really meant by good government.

CHAPTER XI

TO THE FRIENDS OF LIBERTY

JUST after I had finished the last preceding chapter Mr Ralph Nevill wrote to *The Saturday Review* about the nineteenth clause in the new Criminal Justice Bill, which provides that if any householder is suspected of possessing indecent books and some information is laid to that effect a policeman can be given authority to search the whole house and to ascertain what he considers indecent in the way of art or literature in the house.¹ This clause goes about as far as M. Nicodème, to whom I referred at the opening of my chapter on the prude, could possibly wish to go, and I refer to the proposal because it seems to me so typical of modern legislation. I do not know on what grounds any ordinary householder could not be attacked for possessing books or pictures which a policeman might

¹ The informer has to prove an intention to sell, whereas at present he only has to prove that there has been a sale. Proof of intention is easily confused with a presumption that the owner or his executors may one day want to sell the books in question.

consider indecent. The Bible is obviously a case in point, though this may not have occurred to the type of imbecile who brings forward such legislation and carries it through both Houses of Parliament without the knowledge of the general public. Whether the possession of such books and pictures might be supposed to promote the growth of cancer seems at present doubtful; but on the other hand we are told that the use of soap and cosmetics promotes cancer, and probably the Ministry of Health will introduce a bill to abolish soap and cosmetics on this account.

The power of the absurd cranks who legislate for the community is mysterious, and I cannot quite explain it. So far as I have any opportunities of observation, I should have thought that there was a very general and a very sincere enthusiasm for liberty at the present time. The industrial conflicts of to-day, in so far as they are not promoted by the trade-union officials, seem to me to represent a natural revolt against the old notions of the Servile State. There is a distinct rebellion against social conventions, and public opinion shows signs of education even on questions of marriage and divorce. Women as usual are in the van. Many of them seem to have abandoned all responsibility in regard to the obligations of

marriage, and here again their attitude seems a not unnatural revolt against the servitude to which they were subjected during the first seventy years of the nineteenth century. There is an obvious anxiety to transform the public-house into a popular restaurant and to destroy the tyranny of the brewers on the one hand and of the Prohibitionists on the other. One may also perceive in this country a marked hostility towards the persons whom I have generally described as "war-lords," and towards the tyranny of the new bureaucracy.

Where, then, does the real danger to liberty lie? I imagine that it lies principally in the atmosphere of British politics, which, being entirely unrepresentative of the people, favours a considerable amount of hypocrisy and coercion. I believe that any plutocrat who had any enthusiasm to restore the Liberal Party as the party of individual liberty could do so without very much trouble. Yet what is called the Liberal Party to-day appears to represent nothing but a sinister combination of Puritanism and State Socialism; and in these respects it is really more dangerous than the Labour Party, which is obviously more educable. The old proverb, *Corruptio optimi pessima*, still applies to the contemporary Liberal. In these circumstances the friends

of liberty must consider how they can best co-operate in the cause, and I shall here try to put forward a few suggestions for them.

In the first place, we must all maintain a general atmosphere of good will, that is to say, we must all abstain from throwing grit into the wheels of the community. This is not a time when anyone can afford to quarrel about non-essentials. In all matters which concern the welfare of the British Empire and of Europe as a whole we must maintain and preserve the common purpose of saving ourselves, Europe, and civilisation not only from the destructive effects of war, so-called, but also of the devastating disputes which we have learned to associate with what is called peace.

Secondly, we must all keep alive the sense of individual responsibility which is the only condition of any individual liberty. I mean the kind of individual responsibility which the prosperous citizens of the British Empire have shown in regard to war taxation and the payment of our debt to the United States of America. These men all recognised during the War that they had got to pay for it, and since the War they have recognised that all American loans must be repaid, whether we succeed in obtaining repayment of our own loans to our Allies or not. They are not for

this reason prepared to meet the expenses of wholesale jobbery and incompetence, and this distinction must be made clear. The British tax-payer turned a blind eye to the telescope in regard to the financial obliquities of Mr Lloyd George because he thought, rightly or wrongly, that Mr Lloyd George was going to win the War in the end. But to-day he sees clearly that there is no further excuse for these obliquities.

Generally speaking, the Individualist will exert himself to the utmost to meet what he regards as his own private obligations to the commonwealth ; whereas the Socialist seems often inspired by the aim of making the community as a whole discharge obligations which he can personally evade. For example, the Socialist is fond of suggesting that hospitals should be taken over by the State. He prefers this to a system of voluntary contribution ; but I do not see any individual Socialist welcoming the higher death duties and income tax which the scheme would involve. He is, on the whole, much more likely to adopt the best legal means of dodging these higher imposts. It is this state of mind, this evasion of responsibility, and this growing impression that a Socialist community can pay bills which a Socialist individual can dodge, which seems

to me ruinous to all sense of individual obligation and therefore of individual liberty. What is called Individualism has been much abused ; but I believe that it is one of the few real remedies for the discontents of our time.

Thirdly, I consider it the duty of every good citizen to carry on war to the knife with the male or female Puritan who sets out to destroy family ties in the cause of the State and to interfere with Sunday games, normal diet, human intimacies, and reasonable marriage. I do not suggest that this war should involve any intolerance of cranks so long as they are passive ; but the crank cannot be tolerated if he will not or cannot refrain from annoying and molesting the steady, hard-working members of the community. If the crank is going to steal Parliamentary thunder to interfere with the wholesome liberties of the community, then he must be publicly denounced for what he too often is, namely, a bureaucratic parasite, an anti-sex pervert, a Puritan fanatic, and a diseased dipsomaniac. The bureaucratic crank has an eye to his livelihood and also to meddlesome tyranny. The prudish crank has usually been unable to develop any healthy sex growth and ought to be sent to a lunatic asylum if his or her disease is so pronounced as to result in political activity. Puritan fanatics

154 THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

and diseased dipsomaniacs can be tolerated only if they bury their miserable salacity in the obscurity of their own homes. Their interference is not merely an unwarrantable attack against the amenities of the individual, but when successful brings all law and order into contempt. In this way they not only injure human happiness by their anti-social activities but also tamper with the foundations of all human welfare.

They prey upon all the inherent envy, malice, and uncharitableness of human beings, and they derive whatever power they have from nothing more than the obstacles to the co-operation of sane persons which arise from the difficulty of obtaining any really representative government on a democratic franchise. The State inspector, the police court lawyer, and the private detective may derive considerable profit from attacks on human liberty; but I cannot see who else can possibly benefit by them except the blackmailer.

Fourthly, the friends of liberty must actively oppose, in the Press and elsewhere, all forms of persecution, by which I mean unnecessary interference with individuals. It is more important to-day than it ever was to stretch the voluntary principle as far as it will go. It is of course very difficult to do this with those

who profess anti-social or intolerant creeds, or with peculiar people, or with opponents of such measures as vaccination ; but we must never forget that every conversion of an opponent is a step forward, and almost every act of compulsion is a step backward. The State should be careful not to be directly concerned to enforce any definite creed or any theory of conduct. It is the function of the State to suppress crime and to promote social harmony ; but subject to these requirements there must be a fair field and no favour. The record of the Roman Empire and the annals of India under British rule are everlasting models of political wisdom.

The principles of political and religious toleration prolonged the life of the Roman Empire far beyond the natural period of its extinction by ruinous taxation and universal bureaucracy. The same principles have so far preserved the British Empire from destruction. Toleration has been defined as the attitude one adopts to what one does not understand ; but surely this attitude is the only possible preliminary to real understanding. It is at any rate the only possible attitude which can be safe for democracy, for democracy is always more prone to passion than to reflection. This is after all a mere commonplace of

156 THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

what is to-day called the psychology of the mob.

Toleration at least makes room for experiment, whereas intolerance is merely negative. Complete toleration is of course a counsel of perfection ; but it is at any rate a fine ideal both for the State and for the individual citizen. The men of my generation had the good fortune to grow up in a period when that ideal was at any rate respected. The influence of John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer was profoundly felt by those citizens who in the later years of the nineteenth century had a deciding voice in the government of the British Empire. They had many rules of life and traditions which are to-day (however unjustly) regarded with undisguised amusement or contempt. Their prejudices and compromises were necessarily not ours ; but they did at least preserve a certain respect for the fundamental decencies of individual freedom and of social and international intercourse that have been thrown to the winds by a society which, having exhausted its material resources in suicidal warfare, has shown itself incapable of anything but crude violence in a period when rebuilding the whole structure of human civilisation is imperatively necessary. The general opinion to-day seems to be that

individual liberty and responsibility are luxuries and not necessities in human life. My own conviction has always been that individual liberty is the keystone of human society, and this conviction has only been strengthened by the events of the last five years. A Servile State may endure as in ancient history when it is governed by vigorous and responsible aristocrats ; but it can never survive a system under which the slaves have votes.

SOCIALIST ENDS & INDIVIDUALIST MEANS

BY
ARNOLD LUPTON

*I am indebted to Mr Arnold Lupton for permission to reprint
his remarks from "The Individualist" for February 1923*

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IV

THE COLLECTIVIST

NEWSPAPERS, pamphlets and books are full of lamentation—"civilisation will soon come to an end unless it takes a very strong dose of the writer's medicine."

Now this is not altogether surprising—Byron has somewhere some lines something like the following:—"At night, wine, women, laughter; next morning, sermons and soda water."

And so, after the great debauch of the War, it is not surprising that somebody has a headache, and cannot eat, not because his stomach is out of order, but because he has got no victuals. That was to be expected, and, of course, must have been foreseen by every person who was not entirely silly. The war-monger said: "Fight, my lads, and you shall have homes fit for heroes." And no doubt he added to himself: "That's very cheap; there are not many of these lads who will come back again to want a home; if they do, they will have forgotten me; there will not be much money with which to build homes, or furniture

with which to embellish them, or food for those who want to live in them; the world will be much poorer after the War." Of course he did not say that aloud; that would have been very wicked; that is only what he thought.

But there is a depression of spirit, and every person who wishes to reorganise society takes advantage of the occasion to recommend his medicine.

Mr Sidney Webb and his friends say that civilisation is ruined by Capitalism, and will soon come to an end unless that horrible system is destroyed.

On the other hand, Mr Stoddard and his friends say the world is ruined by Bolshevism and Communism, and civilisation will quickly be ruined unless it takes their medicine.

But civilisation goes steadily forward—it takes no notice of Communists or Individualists. The world in the eyes of a philosopher is very much like a Crooke's tube. In that tube the atoms dash backwards and forwards from end to end with lightning rapidity, and if you put a little plate of platinum in the way of these atoms they batter it and make it look brilliantly red. Now our world is full of human atoms which have tremendous energy, dashing about backwards and forwards from East to West as hard as they can go, and if anything gets in

the way they will batter it until it is as bloody as the red flag of the Socialist. As long as this energy is there, the human world will go on. And since in Europe people can only live in large numbers in cities, civilisation will continue as long as there is coal, iron, tin, copper, zinc, silver, gold and platinum—so long as the rain falls, fertilising the plains, and the sun shines, causing vegetation to flourish, and careful husbandry manures the soil, so long will European civilisation continue.

Now Jeremiahs of every kind would feel quite 'humiliated' if only they could realise that the world can be happy without adopting their precise form of civilisation. Men are kept in good form because they have to work hard at least six days a week. It is this work which keeps their bodies in good form and their appetites keen, so that they can enjoy their victuals, even the simplest kind of food; they get more pleasure out of their victuals than the multi-millionaire, unless that gentleman has the good sense to play golf or adopt some other difficult plan of keeping himself in a good state of health.

As regards physical hardships the lot of most people is infinitely better than that of their ancestors four hundred years ago, who lived in huts of wattles and mud, who had difficulty in

or creative? In Great Britain to-day there are forty millions of people, most of them happy, well clothed, well fed, enjoying good health, fairly well educated, quite content with themselves. They have fine cities, good houses, the poorest of them lives in a house in some respects better than the King of England had a thousand years ago. There may be defects in the system; no system is perfect, nobody is more alive to its defects than the capitalists who have built up the present system.

But what have the Socialists done? Surely it would show a little more modesty, a little more capacity of self-restraint, if these vigorous writers had a little more perspective, if they were able to look at society in due proportion, to observe the people on Saturday afternoon when they are at play, on Sunday when they are attending church or walking about, on a working day at their workshops, at the docks, building houses or excavating, in the corn-fields or market-gardens. Look at them, men, women, and children, and say: "~~To~~ these people want to die? Would they sooner that an end was put to their lives than continue in the present civilisation?" The present civilisation is great and prosperous because it is built up on an understanding of human nature, because it is the result of thousands

of years of experience, because our present mechanical aids to work are the results of science and practical knowledge and common sense. Of course the capitalist works for profit; so does everyone — manufacturer, merchant, shopkeeper, engineer, foreman, workman, they all work for profit. What else could they work for? Would you ask a man to go down a coal pit and work hour after hour, day after day, year after year for the sake of something he does not understand — say “Humanity”? He might like to talk about “Humanity” a little bit, he might do for it a few strokes of work every now and then, but it is simply contrary to human nature to ask him to work hard at drudgery for some intangible object. It is simply impossible for human beings as now constructed to do this very hard drudgery day after day, year after year, except because they know that it is absolutely necessary for their comfortable existence. One hundred strokes of the pick will pay for a glass of beer or tea and a bun, 150 will pay for a mutton chop, a little longer work and the miner can buy his wife a new bonnet, a pair of shoes for his youngest boy, a little more and he has paid the cost of his fare to the football match in the wagonette on Saturday afternoon. That is what keeps the work going. The coal

miner is not thinking about his share in the management. He does not want to bother with the management ; that is somebody else's job, not his. He wants to know that for all the work he does he will get a reasonably good pay.

Mr Sidney Webb and those who think with him will have to emulate the Creator and make a man after their own idea, a man who will work all day for someone else, for another man's wife and children. Ladies and gentlemen who have nothing particular to do may find it very amusing to work very hard writing books, giving lectures, and trying to propagate their views, but that is not the dull drudgery of making bricks or breaking stones. A statesman might work at the task of governing the Empire without pay if he had private means (though most of them do get well paid) because the work is so exciting. But I think that Mr Sidney Webb himself would soon get tired of shovelling ashes into a wagon, if that was all his work day after day and week after week. If he thinks that he would go on doing that eight or ten hours a day, let him try. I think he would give it up before very long. Some of the propagandists are very fond of repeating a cry, such as "From each according to his capacity ; to each according to his needs."

“Now that is very good. Nobody can find any fault with that. Why should not each person give according to his capacity, why should not each person be supplied according to his needs? I find no fault with that. But who is to fix the capacity of any man? Why, surely nobody can do it as well as himself, and if he is working at piecework he will get paid according to his capacity, and if that work is useful work to mankind, then the world will benefit by him according to his capacity, because the pay he gets is proportionate to the good that he does. If he is a collier and gets a ton of coal and is paid, say, 3s. a ton for cutting it, that does not represent the whole of the benefit the world gets from that ton of coal. Before that coal is consumed in some foreign town it has reached a price of £3 a ton, and that is the measure of good the collier, with those that have followed him on, has done in getting that ton of coal, and so he is a good illustration of the phrase “From each according to his capacity.” Then there is the other half of the phrase: “To each according to his needs.” Certainly, let every man have what he needs. If he wants a glass of beer, let him buy a glass of beer. If he wants a bottle of champagne, let him pay for it. If he likes a cup of tea, let him have that. If he prefers a glass of milk, by all means let him go to the

dairy. But that is no reason why he should order anyone else to supply him with milk or tea or beer or champagne. If he is ill no doubt other people will help him, and there should be hostels and infirmaries for cases of necessity. If he is hard up and incapable of profitable work he should have assistance according to his needs, not necessarily according to his desires; that is quite another thing. He may desire a great rasher of bacon and two eggs for his breakfast, plenty of bread and butter, and a pint of good ale, but society may think that under the circumstances some good coffee, bread, and margarine might meet his case. Well, this capitalistic society already does that. The workhouses are the finest buildings generally in the city; indoor relief and outdoor relief is given; nobody need starve; nobody need go naked; nobody need go without a fire; the relieving officer will supply everybody; out-of-works caused by the War get special and more generous assistance; they get higher pay now than their fathers got when they were in full work.

But there is another class of Socialistic propagandist who thinks he has a cure for all the ills of society, and that is the legislative Eugenist. He would make laws providing that no person should be married unless he had a

doctor's certificate. No doubt that sounds very fine. But someone else would make a law that nobody should be married unless they had a clergyman's certificate. One is just as reasonable as the other. Another person might make a law that nobody should be married unless he had a certificate of a politician, because we must all recognise that a good understanding of politics and religion and good bodily health are essential to the welfare of the nation. But who are to be the judges? Who shall say whether a man or woman is to be married? Who knows better than they themselves? If it is a politician, a Tory might say nobody but a Tory should be married. A Communist might say nobody but a Communist should be married. A clergyman might very properly say: "Nobody ought to be married or to bring children into the world unless they have accepted my religion." If it is a medical man, which medical man? Is it that class of medical man who thinks that there should be a law that every child should be vaccinated? Can we imagine society governed by legislative Eugenists? They might remedy some evils, but they might create others ten times as great, and there is little doubt that would be the result of any legislative interference. On the whole the people who marry are good people, whether

they are rich or whether they are poor, and they bring up fine children. One thing is noticeable—it is amongst the rich that people marry for money, and marrying for money is not the best motive. It is an honourable motive, no doubt, but not the best motive. The best motive that can actuate a man is the thought that the woman he is marrying is the most beautiful, the cleverest, the best, the most industrious, the kindest woman he has ever met. That is the idea that operates most with the working classes. And the woman marries the man because she thinks he is a fine strong fellow, good and kind and industrious, and will be able to provide for her and her children. And so they produce a fine race. The world has never known a finer race than the present race in Great Britain. All that the people of this country require is liberty, freedom from Government interference. Let people preach and teach as much as they like, but do not let them employ the policeman to dictate as to who shall marry, as to how we shall manufacture and trade, as to whether we shall go to school or stop away from school, as to the religion we shall believe or shall not believe; let the policeman be confined to his one occupation, that of keeping order, so that every person shall be free to do what he likes so long as he

does not injure his neighbour by robbery or violence or making a public nuisance. The ends desired by the Socialists are delightful, magnificent, glorious, but these ends can only be reached by the methods of Individualism.

ARNOLD LUPTON.

PROHIBITION IN AMERICA

BY

A. P. HERBERT

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VI

PROHIBITION IN AMERICA

IT is a hard thing to be asked to say what one thinks about Prohibition in a short compass; and I am inclined to think, as the Psalmist thought in another context, that one word is better than a thousand. I spent only eight weeks in the United States (in 1921), but less than that has served to furnish many a lusty book about America, and much less than that gives a man a title to talk about Prohibition. Indeed, if he sets foot in that friendly land with but a single introduction, it is strange if before nightfall he has not a working knowledge of the subject, together with a fair grasp of the American Constitution, a handy guide to law-breaking, and a suspended conscience. It is therefore hard also to speak frankly on this theme without seeming to abuse a country which I respect and admire, and a hospitality which even Prohibition cannot discourage. But I hope to placate any American friend who may chance to read these remarks by using such moderation of language as the subject demands.

As to the origins of this monstrous stupidity, I doubt if I can help Mr Haynes very much, for, try as I would, I could never extract any lucid explanation of them. Mr Haynes thinks it is "one aspect of a Puritanism which interferes with liberty in many other ways." And that, no doubt, is a part, but not, I think, the whole of the matter; for many a New Yorker who is very far from Puritanism, and allows his wife to smoke a cigarette quite openly in her own drawing-room, will yet admit, reluctantly, and over a cocktail, that Prohibition is a good thing. Sometimes my instructors levelled vague charges against "the air," the suggestion being that the air of that continent is itself so strong a stimulant that alcohol is doubly dangerous. Indeed, hearing them talk, one would have thought that every American citizen went normally rolling round the streets, half-drunk with air. And it is, I suppose, this heady and obstreperous atmosphere which causes so many Amerians to pour no water on their whisky.

Then, of course, as Mr Haynes observes, there are the Efficiency-mongers. I never took a cocktail with any lady who did not agree that Prohibition was an excellent thing for the working-classes; and it seems to be true that those working-men who do not take to drugs, distil whisky (*sic*) in the kitchen, go blind, murder

their wives, or perish miserably of wood alcohol, do work much better than they did on a Monday, and by their augmented output help their employers to face the high cost of liquor.

But, as a rule, as in most other contexts, one was led very soon to politics, corruption, and the Irish. "Prohibit whisky, prohibit spirits, if you like," I used to say, "for these indeed are inventions of the devil; but wine and beer are honest gifts of the gods. Why not let them at least remain—diluted if necessary with milk-and-soda?" "Yes, that's what many of us would have liked," said the richer men. "But the Saloon—we had to wipe out the Saloon." This is much the most favourite line of argument, and the only one which the only active Prohibitionist I met seriously employed. But I must confess I never got it clear. The Saloon—the Saloon was a scandal—it was run by the Irish—it was a hotbed of political intrigue—it provided bad spirit—and so on. But exactly why the Saloon could not be reformed without making it a criminal offence for a man to have a bottle of *Château Yquem* in his house, I never could discover. When pressed, my friends would murmur, "Corruption—the Saloon . . .," and send down for another bottle of sherry.

The truth is, I fear—and I hope my American friends will forgive the remark—that as a nation

they seem to have very little idea of social liberty. They are not so much Puritan as persecuted. Formal political liberty and formal social equality they have *ad nauseam*, but these are poor substitutes. They seem to like it when an Irish policeman flourishes his club at a gentleman in the street and refers to him as "That Man," for this shows that all men are equal, and the gentleman is as good as the policeman. But he is not—not by many miles. Anyone who shouts loud enough for a long time will put the gentleman in his place—and he seems to enjoy it. For he has no King and no titled aristocracy, and he flatters himself he is a sturdy, independent fellow, standing no nonsense. But in fact I found him a little cowed, with the habit of being dragooned and bullied and sitting down under it—under the policeman, the Press, the politicians, the literary critics, his wife, the Irish, the Middle-West, and any kind of tom-fool League or organisation that has the energy, cash and Publicity organisation to spread it abroad day and night, for years together, that black is white, or peppermints bad for the soul. That, to a lover of liberty, is the sad thing about Prohibition, not that it was allowed to happen, not that many people believe in it, but that no one seems to have the vigour or inclination

to stand up and have it stamped out, not even those who spend their days blaspheming and evading it. Walking down Fifth Avenue my first day in New York, I was shocked to see a notice on the side-walk—NO LOITERING—KEEP MOVING. It was as if in Bond Street one had been confronted with the legend—DON'T STAND ABOUT HERE. The explanation, I discovered, was this. At that point the "shopping" district merges into an area of wholesale "houses," whose employees used to crowd out into Fifth Avenue during the lunch-hour, and enjoy the sun on the side-walk. Some rich shops complained that these people were spoiling the atmosphere of their "frontals" and keeping away the wealthy customer, whereupon a City Ordinance was issued, and now the wholesale employee loiters at his peril north (I think) of Thirty-fourth Street. A wise and proper discrimination, no doubt; my point is—and this is but a single illustration—that no man can imagine the enforcement of a like regulation in London without riot, murder, and civil war. And with this national habit of discipline, or knuckling under, whichever you will, Prohibition may endure for many months to come.

As to the effects—they tell me the drug-trade was never better, crime increases, and in the

month of December 1922, according to Dr Charles Norris, the Medical Examiner for New York, thirty-four persons perished of wood alcohol in the sacred cause of total abstinence. Mrs John Jerome Rooney, Chairman of the National Association for the Suppression of the Drug Evil, states that there are over 2,000,000 persons in the United States using drugs to-day. Three years ago there were only 1,000,000. She counted them both years. As to murder, Dr Hoffman, the consulting statistician of the Prudential Insurance Company of America, concludes that "in twenty-eight American cities for which the records are available" the rate per 100,000 of the population was, in 1900, 5·1; in 1901, 4·9; in 1920, 8·5, and in 1921, 9·3; and, no doubt, in the wilder cities, where murders are less carefully recorded, the figures would be even more remarkable. Meanwhile, in bibulous England and Wales (which includes of course the peaceful countryside, so that the comparison is scarcely fair) the murder-rate in 1901 was 0·5, and in 1921 had slumped to a paltry 0·23.

I take these statements from the Chairman of a Brewery Company's address to the shareholders,¹ and quote them for what they are worth. They are not necessary. I never

¹ *Times*, 7th March 1923.

witnessed an American murder, and none of the 2,000,000 offered me a drug. But the minor demoralisation is plain for any man to see. In the Eastern States, at least, you have a whole population openly deriding what they regard as a foolish law, and gleefully grasping every opportunity to commit an offence which they do not recognise as wrongful; old gentlemen taking to cocktails like mischievous children, old ladies distilling whisky in the basement because it is naughty, and Quakers gathering on Sunday mornings after Church to discuss new ways of getting "IT." I think it is fair to say that most of those who drank moderately but regularly before, drink more than they did, the difference being that they now drink almost nothing but whisky, and often bad whisky, or, in the alternative, gin: and, to judge by their conversation, they think about it more and more. In time, presumably, the wine-cellars of the rich will be emptied; and then (for I believe that little wine, if any, is imported), then no one will drink any liquor but whisky and gin—fatal or not, as the case may be. Meanwhile, the scandal of the saloon thus gloriously destroyed, an entirely new world of official corruption has been created. Prohibition officers seize liquor from the "bootleggers," and sell it at a reasonable increment

to decent citizens who can afford it. Some resorts have understandings with authority, some not. I myself stood in a Kentucky bar and through the glass door watched the policeman strolling down the street; the Irish barman, after rebuking me for "spoiling" the raw spirit he offered me with water, assured me that I stood in no danger of arrest. The scandal of the saloon, whatever that was, must have been grave indeed.

It is all a joke, of course, but a terribly degrading joke. To see a gentleman in full evening-dress, in the big dining-room of one of the best hotels in New York, stoop and furtively draw from his overcoat under the chair a naked quart-bottle of whisky; to see men creeping up the stairs of low-class lodging-houses to be served with secret cocktails in a dingy bedroom; to see them clustered in an empty room in the heart of New York, a room bare of all furniture but a few chairs, and many cases of liquor, a room to which one is admitted by a pass-word or a hieroglyphic on a card, through a door which represents it to be the office of a jute-merchant; to be served with cocktails in coffee-cups and have mysterious brown-paper parcels thrust into one's pocket by hospitable friends—all this is funny, for a time, to the visitor, at least, but it is a shame that men

"should be forced to do such things, an affront to the human spirit and the spirit of liberty. And do them they will—and small blame to them—so long as this barbarous folly continues, if only on the principle of the Englishman who, on entering the bathroom of a country hotel, observed with astonishment the notice, "DO NOT SMOKE IN THE BATH," remarked, "Good God!" and lighted his pipe.

Many grown men must remember the hungry days of the last year of the war when chocolate was scarce, and what a wild, new craving came to them for chocolate then; and how they pined for cheese who never looked twice at cheese before. And if the day ever comes in Merrie England, as come it may, when it is unlawful to eat bull's-eyes or *nougat*, I have no doubt that the whole country will be swept by a very passion for bull's-eyes, and rich men squander their savings on *nougat*, consoling themselves with the thought that the teeth of the working-classes are better than ever. That is what is happening in America, as I see it. And the right name for the Eighteenth Amendment is Provocation.

And alas! "Many a true word . . ." In Kansas, they tell me, cigarettes are already illegal. This may or may not be so, but I know they are on the Black List of certain

benevolent Societies, Leagues, and what-nots over there—cigarettes and chocolate, tea and coffee, and all the other poisons and perils of this life, together with silk embroidery, hot-water-bottles, and osculation. So far we have already one such maniac in Parliament. Let us be careful.

A. P. HERBERT.

Perhaps in fairness to some righteous men in the United States I ought to add to Mr A. P. Herbert's appendix the following words of wisdom :—

“The ideal of social freedom is to be found in a group of friends, aware of one another's differences and interested in their development, but equally aware of an underlying unity of spirit and ready to subordinate their own differences for the maintenance of the common understanding. In such a group individuals are not externally limited by one another, but are interpenetrated by a common spirit that enlarges and enriches their own lives. The personality of each is interpreted by that of his fellows and reflected back upon him in a greater and more sympathetic understanding of life as

a whole. Only through such community, sustained by voluntary action, can the individual escape from the constraints of alien wills and achieve true social freedom. Improved democratic machinery may do something to register more accurately men's wills, but until those wills themselves are socialised the result will not be liberty."

This passage appears under the name of Mr Norman Wilde in *The International Journal of Ethics* for April 1923. He agrees with Mr Santayana that individual liberty cannot exist in a democratic state without the English spirit of compromise and allowance for the idiosyncrasies of minorities and individuals.

INDEX

A

ADMINISTRATIVE facilities, purchase of, 137
Agents provocateurs, 109
 Agriculture, encouragement of, 29
 America and social liberty, 180
 Anglo-American financial alliance, 124
 Arbitration, international, 122
 Aristocracy, English, 28, 135
 Armament maker, the, 122
 Arnold, Matthew, 53
 Astor, Lady, and prohibition, 100
 — — — and the despotism of the nursery, 140
 Atkin, Lord Justice, 68

B

BANBURY, SIR FREDERICK, 139
 Baptist Union and divorce, 45
 Bax, Belfort, 115
 Belloc, Mr, 15, 98
 Birth control, 15, 47, 110
 Bismarck, 119
 Blake, William, 51
 Bolshevism, 13, 18, 86
 Bradlaugh, Mr, 22
 British Government, the, 19
 — — — and Turkey, 126
 Bryce, Lord, 16, 17
 Buharin, 80
 Bully, the, 23

C

CALVEN, JOHN, 53, 54
 Calvinism and Judaism, 54
 Calvinism, 57

Canadian frontier, the, 121
 Canterbury, Archbishop of, 32
 Capitalism, 165
 Capitalist, the super-, 36, 58, 127, 135, 136
 Carlyle, 56
 Catholic Church and morality, 49
 — — — the, 57
 — — — and liberty, 60
 Cave, Sir George, 111
 Chapman, Mr Cecil, 111
 Charman, the case of Mr, 33
 Chesterton, G. K., 24
 — — — and Prussianism, 72, 73
 — — — describes the Puritan master of industry, 129
 China, 13
 — — — opium in, 94
 Christianity and Individualism, 13
 Church and Chapel, 39
 — — — and morality, 40
 — — — in relation to marriage, property, intoxicating liquors, and Sunday games, 42
 — — — unpopularity of, 51
 Church of England, 39
 Civilisation and Communists, 162
 Cocaine and morphia, campaign against, 94
 Coercion, 18, 20, 145
 Collectivism, 8, 59
 Collectivist, 18, 62, 64, 65, 66, 72, 78, 135, 161
 Commissars, the People's, 84, 85
 Communism, 77, 78
 — — — Bertrand Russell on, 75
 — — — Pollock, Johnson, 76
 Communist Manifesto, 79
 — — — Party, 86, 89
 — — — and women, 89
 — — — the, 165
 Communists, the, 90

• **Conscription and the Quakers**, 17
Conservatives and the Labour Party, 30
 "Continental leaders," 89
Councils, the Congress of, 84
Crank, the bureaucratic, 153
 — — prudish, 153
Cranks, power of absurd, 149
Criminal Justice Bill, 148

D

• **DARWIN**, 56
Democracy, modern, 20, 57
Democrat, the, and the poor, 146
Divorce, 32
 — cases, reporting, 143
 — in Scotland, 45
Doles, mischievous effect of, 37
 "Dry" Party, 97
Dynast, the, 119

E

EDUCATION, compulsory, 20, 21
 — universal, 21
Efficiency-mongers, 178
England, Hebraisation of, 55
Ergatocracy, 81
Eugenist, the legislative, 170
Europe at the mercy of the Turk, 123
 — mediæval, and feudal service, 93
Everett, Mr., 69
Excommunication and the Church of England, 39
Ex-Kaiser William, 118, 119

F

• **FABIAN, the**, 135
Faddists, plutocratic and cocoa-drinking, 140, 141
Fanatic, the, 22
Fascismo, 7
Feudalism, 14
Financier, the, an enemy of liberty, 126

FitzRoy, Sir Almeric, 71
Force and coercion, 19
France, Anatole, 103
 — and Germany, the Kilkenny-cat policy of, 121
 — and the bridge-heads of the Rhine, 122
 — her artists and writers, 56
Freedom, personal, 117
Funds, Party, 19

G

GAMES, Sunday, 48
Gentile, English, 55
George, Lloyd, 28, 37
Good will, 151
Government, Collectivist, 65
Greek Church, the, 60

H

HALDANE, LORD, 69
Hardships, physical, 163
Haynes, Mr., 178
Hebraism, 55
Herbert, A. P., 98, 186
 — Auberon, 141
 — Col. Aubrey, 139
Hindenburg, 119
Holy Orders, persecution by the French Government of, 87
Honours, sale of, 19, 136
House of Commons under Lloyd George, 37
 — of Lords, 37
 "Humanity," 167

I

INCHEAPE, NOEL, 90
Indecent books, possession of, 148
Individual, the, 13
Individualism, 13, 14
Individualist and Socialist—a comparison, 152
Industrial revolution, 14
Influence, secret, 19

Inquisition, the, 19
 Insurance Act, the, 31
International Journal of Ethics,
 187
 International Labour Organisa-
 tion, 90
 Ives, Mr, 190

J

JAPAN, 13
 — and the Russian Fleet at Port
 Arthur, 126
 Jenks, Edward, 115
 Jew, German, 55
 — English, 55
 Judaism and Calvinism, 54
 Jurors, female, 111

K

KARL MARX, 83
 King's Proctor, 109
 Ku-Klux-Klan, 19

L

LABOUR leader, 36
 — Party, the, 59, 150
 — — and Conservatives, 30
 Land taxes, 29
 League of Nations, 119, 124
 Legitimation, 31, 47
 Leisure hours, measures for
 utilising, 90, 91
 Lenin, 80, 87
 Leverhulme, Lord, 134
 Liberal Party, the, 150
 Liberty, 8, 13, 14, 24, 57, 138
 — absence of, 15
 — and conscription, 17
 — attacks on human, 154
 — civil, 16
 — definitions of, 16, 17
 — enemy of, 17
 — hatred of, 19
 — individual, 15, 16, 20, 27, 157
 — political, 16
 — religious, 16
 — the defender, 18
 — the suppression of social, 61

Liquors, intoxicating, and
 Church and Chapel, 43
 London, death-rate in, 164
 Lunacharskys, the, 80
 Lunacy Act, the, 67
 — administration, 67
 Luxemburg, Rosa, 89
 Lynching, 19

M

MAGEE, Archbishop, and uni-
 versal freedom, 101
 Magnate, the industrial, 128
 — — newspaper, 28, 133
 — — railway, 131
 Maine, Sir Henry, 77
 Mallock, W. H., 64
 Manifestoes, moral, 41
 Marriage, the Church and, 44
 — and the working-classes, 172
 Marx, Karl, 76
 Megalomaniac, the, 25
 Mill, John Stuart, 56, 141, 156
 Mob law, 19
 Moralists, modern, 50
 Morality and the State, 40
 Morris, William, 66
 Morrison, Walter, 141
 Moulton, Lord, 25
 Mussolini, 7

N

NAPOLEON, 118
 — the Third, 118, 119
 Nevill, Ralph, 148
News of the World, people who
 batten on the, 144
 Newspaper habit, spread of the,
 35
 — readers, poor and unim-
 portant, 143
 Nicodème, M., 148

O

ONEIDA COMMUNITY, the, 79
 Ownership, the prosperity of
 small, 15

P

PARLIAMENT, prestige of, 37
 Party Funds, 19, 137
 Patronage, aristocratic, 56
 Paul, Eden and Cedar, 80
 Pauls, the, 82, 83, 86, 87
 Peasant proprietors, 14
 Persecution, 154
 Philistine, the wealthy, 58
 Philistinism, 55
 Piecework, 169
 Plato's Republic, 79
 Plutoerat, the, 64
 Police—the abuse of power, 70
 — the power of the, 30
 Political action in a free State, 145
 Politician, the, 139
 — — Nationalist, 120
 Pollock, Mr, 84
 Population, educated, 21
 Presbyterians, Belfast, and divorce, 45
 President Wilson, 121
 Press, the, and the suppression of truth, 133
 Prime Minister, the present, and public opinion, 146
 Prohibition, 94, 177
 — and official corruption, 183
 — case strengthened by adulteration, 96
 — in America, 96
 — in Russia, 97
 — some effects of, 182
 — the evils of, 184
 Prohibitionist, the, 93
 Proletariat, a servile, 58
 Property, private, and Church and Chapel, 42
 Protestant world, politician of the, 59
 Prude, the, 102
 — activities of the, 111
 Prudery, types of, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109
 Prussia, Bolshevik Russia, and Japan, danger of alliance between, 124
 — not dead, 125
 Prussian spirit, the, 145

Public Health Acts, irksomeness of, 145
 — safety, 17
 Puritan fanatics, 153
 — the modern, 59
 — the female, 153
 — the transatlantic, 100
 Puritanism and State Socialism, 150
 — in the United States, 99
 — its different forms, 53

QUAKERS, the, and conscription, 17

R

RAILWAY magnates, 135
 Reading, Lord Chief-Justice, 68
 Religious toleration, 155
 Responsibility, individual, 151, 157
 Revolution, industrial, 14
 Ritchie, Professor, 54
 Rousseau, 57
 Ruskin, 56
 — College, 82
 Russell, Bertrand, 28
 — Earl, and individual liberty, 144
 Russia and the redemption of the world from its present misery, 124
 — prohibition in, 97
 — property in, 76
 Russian peasant, the, 128
 — people, the, 87

S

SAFETY, public, 17
 Saklatvala, Mr, 89
 "Saloon," the, 179
 Samuraj, the Japanese, 80
 Santayana, Mr, 187
Saturday Review, 148
 Secret societies, coercion by, 19

Servile State, the, 31, 36, 90,
135, 137, 140, 157
Shaw, Bernard, 141
Smallpox, 21
Social conventions, rebellion
against, 149
— freedom, 35, 186
Socialism and Communism, dis-
tinction between, 81
Socialist, the, 62
Socialists; what have they
done? 166
Solicitation, the law on, 112
Spencer, 56, 63, 141, 156
Spinster voters and conscrip-
tion, 143
State control, 60
— morality, the inadequacy of,
40
— the, and the allegiance of its
citizens, 36
— the function of the, 155
Sterilisation, 70
Stiunes, 125
Stoddard, Mr, and Bolshevism
162
Stolypin, reforms of, 77
Sunday games, 48
Super-capitalist, 15
Swinburne, 56

T

TAX-PAYER, the British, and
Lloyd George, 152
"The Inner Council of Nine," 89
"The Servile State," 15
The Workers' Weekly, 89
Third International, the, 81
Thompson, Mrs, and Bywaters,
the murderers, relations be-
tween, 35
Tirpitz, 119, 120
Toleration, definition of, 155, 156

Trotsky, 80, 83, 87
Trusts, 19, 30
Turkey, 13

U

UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE, the,
138
— States, 8
— — — and Puritanism, 99
— — — our debt to, 151
— — — raw spirit drinking in, 99

V

VACCINATION, 21
Venereal disease, 110
Vodka, 98

W

WAR-LORD, the, 118, 150
Webb, Mr and Mrs Sidney, 141
— Sidney, 168
— — — and civilisation, 162
— — — and human nature, 164
— the, scheme of the universe,
142
Wedgwood, Col., M.P., 33
Welfare, compulsory social, 65
— social, 22
Wells, H. G., 66, 80
"Wet" areas, 97
Wilde, Norman, 187
Women, citizenship of, 34
— in the House of Commons, 140
Workers' Educational Associa-
tion, 82

Y

YEOMAN farmers, 14
Younger, Lord, 139

